March 22, 2010

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
BEFORE THE SECRETARY OF THE COMMISSION

In the matter of	
Pacific Gas and Electric Company	Docket Nos. 50-275-LR
Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant	50-323-LR
Units 1 and 2	

REQUEST FOR HEARING AND PETITION TO INTERVENE BY SAN LUIS OBISPO MOTHERS FOR PEACE

I. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC's) hearing notice, 75 Fed. Reg. 3,493 (January 21, 2010), and pursuant to 10 CFR 2.309(f), San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace (SLOMFP) files this Request for Hearing and Petition to Intervene in the license renewal proceeding for the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant (DCNPP).

II. DEMONSTRATION OF STANDING

SLOMFP has been a participant in NRC licensing cases involving DCNPP since 1973. The organization has standing to intervene in this case because many of its members live, work, and own property within 50 miles of the plant, and their interests may be affected by the results of the proceeding. Their health, safety, property value, and means of livelihood could be adversely affected by a licensing decision which permitted DCNPP to continue to operate for an extended period in a manner that is unsafe or harmful to the environment. For instance, if an accident and consequent offsite radiation release were to occur at DCNPP, the health, safety, property value, and means of livelihood of neighbors of the plant, including members of SLOMFP, could be seriously harmed. SLOMFP has attached declarations from four individual members who have authorized SLOMFP to bring this legal action on their behalves. *See*

Declaration of Elizabeth Apfelberg (Exhibit 1A), Declaration of Elaine Holder (Exhibit 1B), Declaration of Lucy Jane Swanson (Exhibit 1C) and Declaration of Jill ZamEk (Exhibit 1D).

III. CONTENTIONS

SLOMFP's contentions are set forth below. Section A contains SLOMFP's safety contention (labeled with the prefix "TC"). Section B contains SLOMFP's environmental contentions (labeled with the prefix "EC").

A. Safety Contentions

Contention TC 1 – Failure to demonstrate adequacy of program for management of aging equipment

1. Statement of the Contention: The applicant, Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E), has failed to satisfy 10 C.F.R. § 54.29's requirement to demonstrate a reasonable assurance that it can and will "manage[e] the effects of aging" on equipment that is subject to the license renewal rule, i.e., safety equipment without moving parts. In particular, PG&E has failed to show how it will address and rectify an ongoing pattern of management failures with respect to the operation and maintenance of safety equipment.

2. Brief Summary of Basis for the Contention: The NRC's standard for license renewal, 10 C.F.R. § 54.29(a), states that an operating license may be renewed if the Commission finds, among other things, that:

> (a) Actions have been identified and have been or will be taken with respect to the matters identified in paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(2) of this section, such that there is reasonable assurance that the activities authorized by the renewed license will continue to be conducted in accordance with the CLB [current licensing basis], and that any changes made to the plant's CLB in order to comply with this paragraph are in accord with the Act and the Commission's regulations. These matters are:
>
> (1) managing the effects of aging during the period of extended operation on the functionality of structures and components that have been identified to require review under § 54.21(a)(1).

. . .

In Appendix B of its license renewal application, PG&E describes its program for managing the aging equipment that is subject to the license renewal rule under 10 C.F.R. § 54.21(a)(1). As explained on page B-4, during the license renewal term, PG&E will use the same personnel to manage aging equipment that are described in the Final Safety Analysis Report for DCNPP, *i.e.,* that PG&E currently uses. PG&E's aging management program is deficient because it does not discuss how it will avoid repeating the chronic and significant errors it is currently committing in the management of safety equipment at DCNPP.

Examples of these errors are provided in recent integrated inspection reports: Diablo Canyon Power Plant NRC Integrated Inspection Report 05000275/2008005, 05000323/2008005 AND 07200026/2008001 (February 6, 2008) ("IIR 08-05") (ADAMS Accession No. ML090370406); Diablo Canyon Power Plant NRC Integrated Inspection Report 05000275/2009003 and 05000323/2009003 (August 5, 2009) ("IIR 09-03") (ADAMS Accession No. ML092170781); Diablo Canyon Power Plant NRC Integrated Inspection Report 05000275/2009005 and 05000323/2009005 (February 3, 2010) ("IIR 09-05") (ML100341199). These inspection reports document an ongoing failure of PG&E to properly identify, evaluate, and resolve problems and manage safety equipment. For example:

- In IIR-08-05, the NRC inspectors reported on their "semi-annual trend review" of PG&E's corrective action program and associated documents "to identify trends that could indicate the existence of a more significant safety issue." *Id.,* Enclosure at 24. The inspectors found an "adverse trend in problem evaluation," concluding that:

  > PG&E used less than adequate thoroughness when evaluating problems resulting in the failure to identify the extent of conditions; and in some cases, adverse affects (sic) on the operability of Technical Specification required equipment.

> This adverse trend began during the fourth quarter 2007 and continued through the fourth quarter 2008.

Id. at 24. The inspectors provided 11 separate examples of this adverse trend.

Id. at 24-25.

- In IIR 09-03, the inspectors' semi-annual trend review found that the adverse trend in problem evaluation identified in IIR-08-05 "continued during the first two quarters of 2009." *Id.,* Enclosure at 21. The inspectors:

  > analyzed this trend and identified a common theme related to poor licensee management of the plant design/licensing bases and inconsistent implementation of regulatory administrative processes. The inspectors concluded that some issues identified in the trend could indicate the existence of a more significant concern affecting the NRC's ability to regulate the license."

  Id. The inspectors then identified thirteen separate examples of instances of "poor licensing and design basis management" and five instances of deficiencies related to other administrative functions. Examples include:

  > - Failure to perform an adequate 50.59 evaluation for spent fuel pool special test… This minor violation illustrated the licensee's failure to implement the industry 50.59 program…
  >
  > - Failure to perform an adequate 50.59 evaluation for modifications to the special protection scheme for the 500 kV switchyard… This minor violation illustrated the licensee's failure to implement the industry 50.59 program…
  >
  > - An inadequate 50.59 evaluation for the Unit 1 containment sump modification… This violation illustrated a failure to understand when prior NRC approval is required for change to the facility as described in the Final Safety Analysis Report Update.
  >
  > - Violation of the station 50.59 evaluation procedure… This finding illustrated the failure of the licensee to recognize a condition outside of the plant design basis associated with an explosive mixture of oxygen and hydrogen discovered in the Unit 2 reactor coolant drain tank, waste gas surge tank, and interconnecting piping.
  >
  > - Violation of design control associated with the failure to maintain adequate capacity and capability of the emergency diesel generators…. This finding

> illustrated the failure of the licensee to understand and apply the plant design and licensing basis to onsite emergency power system.

NRC inspectors also noted an "Adverse Trend in Design Margin and Capability of ac Power Systems" in this report, affecting all three of the plant ac power systems. *Id.*, Enclosure at 24.

- In IIR-09-05, once again the NRC inspectors found that "adverse trends associated with the thoroughness of Pacific Gas and Electric's program evaluation, originally identified by the NRC in September 2008 [in IIR008-05] continued through 2009." *Id.*, Enclosure at 35. Although IIR-09-05 describes various efforts by PG&E to correct the adverse trend, the NRC inspectors remained dissatisfied with the comprehensiveness of PG&E's analyses and corrective actions. *Id.* at 36-37.

The inspection reports cited above raise a genuine and material dispute regarding PG&E's ability to manage the effects of aging into the renewal period. The public has no reason for confidence that a renewed Diablo Canyon licensee would reasonably ensure protection of public health and safety. PG&E has shown that it cannot adequately identify, evaluate, and resolve maintenance problems involving safety equipment and systems.

3. Demonstration that the Contention is Within the Scope of the Proceeding: This contention is within the scope of the proceeding because it raises questions about the adequacy of PG&E's program for managing aging equipment under NRC regulations that must be satisfied before DCNPP can be re-licensed.

4. Demonstration that the Contention is Material to the Findings NRC Must Make to Re-License Diablo Canyon: Before the NRC may re-license DCNPP, it must conclude that PG&E can manage the effects of aging on passive equipment. Because PG&E has demonstrated a consistent pattern of inadequate management of safety equipment, the contention is material to the findings that NRC must make in reviewing PG&E's operating license renewal application.

5. Concise Statement of the Facts or Expert Opinion Supporting the Contention, Along With Appropriate Citations to Supporting Scientific or Factual Materials: The facts which support Contention TC-1 are set forth in paragraph 2 above. The facts are reported in Appendix B of PG&E's operating license renewal application and in NRC inspection reports, to which SLOMFP has provided citations.

B. Environmental Contentions

1. Statutory and Regulatory Background

The "core" requirement of NEPA is that for any federal action with a significant adverse effect on the human environment, federal agencies must prepare an environmental impact statement ("EIS") which includes a "detailed statement" regarding:

> (i) the environmental impact of the proposed action, (ii) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented, (iii) alternatives to the proposed action, (iv) the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and (v) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.

San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace, 149 F.3d at 1020 (citing *Dept. of Transp. v. Pub. Citizen,* 541 U.S. 752, 756 (2004), 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C)). NRC regulations also require that an NRC application for operating license renewal must be supported by an environmental report prepared by the applicant (10 C.F.R. § 51.53(c) and a supplemental EIS prepared by the NRC Staff. 10 C.F.R. § 51.95(c). In discussing alternatives to the proposed action, the applicant must discuss "alternatives to mitigate severe accidents." 10 C.F.R. § 51.53(c)(3)(iii)(L). The NRC must also discuss mitigative alternatives in its supplemental EIS. 10 C.F.R. § 51.95(c)(2).

In addition, an Environmental Report or EIS must also address "new and significant information" that was not previously addressed in an EIS for the facility. 10 C.F.R. §§ 51.53(c)(iv), 51.92(a)(2).

The Council on Environmental Quality ("CEQ") has promulgated regulations for the implementation of NEPA that are entitled to substantial deference by the NRC. *San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace v. NRC,* 449 F.3d 1016 (9th Cir. 2006), cert. denied, 127 S.Ct. 1124 (2007) (citing *Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council,* 490 U.S. 332, 355, (1989); *Andrus v. Sierra Club*, 442 U.S. 347, 358 (1979)). Among those regulations, 40 C.F.R. § 1502.22 requires that:

> When an agency is evaluating reasonably foreseeable significant adverse effects on the human environment in an environmental impact statement and there is incomplete or unavailable information, the agency shall always make clear that such information is lacking.
>
> (a) If the incomplete information relevant to reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives and the overall costs of obtaining it are not exorbitant, the agency shall include the information in the environmental impact statement.
>
> (b) If the information relevant to reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts cannot be obtained because the overall costs of obtaining it are exorbitant or the means to obtain it are not known, the agency shall include within the environmental impact statement:
>
> > 1. A statement that such information is incomplete or unavailable.
> >
> > 2. a statement of the relevance of the incomplete or unavailable information to evaluating reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts on the human environment;
> >
> > 3. a summary of existing credible scientific evidence which is relevant to evaluating the reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts on the human environment, and
> >
> > 4. the agency's evaluation of such impacts based upon theoretical approaches or research methods generally accepted in the scientific community. For the purposes of this section, "reasonably foreseeable" includes impacts which have

> catastrophic consequences, even if their probability of occurrence is low, provided that the analysis of the impacts is supported by credible scientific evidence, is not based on pure conjecture, and is within the rule of reason.

As the CEQ explained in promulgating 10 C.F.R. § 1502.22, the "overall cost" of providing complete information includes the timing of the information: "CEQ intends that the term 'overall costs' encompasses financial costs and other costs such as costs in terms of time (delay) and personnel." National Environmental Policy Act Regulations; Incomplete or Unavailable Information, 51 Fed. Reg. 15,618, 15,622 (April 25, 1986).

2. Contentions

Contention EC–1: Failure of SAMA Analysis to Include Complete Information About Potential Environmental Impacts of Earthquakes and Related SAMAs

1. Statement of Contention: PG&E's Severe Accident Mitigation Alternatives ("SAMA") analysis fails to satisfy 40 C.F.R. § 1502.22 because it is not based on complete information that is necessary for an understanding of seismic risks to the Diablo Canyon nuclear power plant and because PG&E has failed to acknowledge the absence of the information or demonstrated that the information is too costly to obtain. As a result of PG&E's failure to use complete information, the SAMA analysis does not satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") for consideration of alternatives (*see Idaho Conservation League v. Mumma*, 956 F.2d 1508, 1519-20 (9th Cir. 1992)) or NRC implementing regulation 10 C.F.R. § 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(L).

2. Brief Summary of Basis for the Contention:

a. Factual Background

In 2008, PG&E informed the NRC that it had identified "a zone of seismicity that may indicate a previously unknown fault located offshore of the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant," which is known as the "Shoreline Fault." NRC Research Information Letter 09-001, *Preliminary Deterministic Analysis of Seismic Hazard at Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant from Newly Identified "Shoreline Fault"* at 10-11 (April 8, 2009) ("RIL-09-001") (ADAMS Accession No. ML090330523). The fault was identified as a result of a "collaborative research program" conducted jointly by PG&E and the United States Geological Survey ("USGS") under the Collaborative Research and Development Agreement ("CRADA"). *Id.* As described in RIL-09-0001, the PG&E-USGS research program "focused on increasing the understanding of tectonics in the region of the DCNPP," and "included both new geophysical field studies and the application of advanced seismological techniques to small-magnitude recorded earthquakes." *Id.*

While describing the fault as "hypothesized" and "potential" (*id.*), PG&E and the NRC Staff both immediately took actions to address the significance of the newly discovered fault. First, both PG&E and the NRC Staff undertook assessments to determine whether the fault posed any hazard to the ongoing operation of DCNPP that had not been previously taken into consideration. *Id.* These analyses were deterministic in nature and were based on the "preliminary" information that had been yielded to date by the PG&E-USGS research program. *Id.*

Second, PG&E worked with the USGS to "reallocate resources to characterize the Shoreline Fault rather than retaining the original focus that is more regional in nature." *Id.* at 3.

At the end of 2008, PG&E issued an Action Plan to carry out this reallocation effort. *Id.* As described in the Action Plan document:

> The Plan has three objectives. The first objective is to characterize the Shoreline fault in terms of its location, geometry, activity rate, rupture characteristics, and relation to the Hosgri fault zone.[1] The second objective is to evaluate the ancient (Tertiary) shear zone west of the power block structure for evidence of secondary deformation that may have been associated with the Shoreline fault. The third objective is to estimate potential ground motions from the Shoreline fault, including both independent rupture of the Shoreline fault and possible synchronous rupture with the Hosgri fault.

Action Plan, Section I at 1 (December 17, 2008) (ADAMS Accession No. ML090720505).

With respect to the schedule for implementation of the Action Plan, PG&E stated that it would complete a report on these issues by the fourth quarter of 2010. *Id.,* Section VII at 6. PG&E also stated that:

> An updated evaluation of the seismic hazard at DCPP will be conducted by PG&E Geosciences as part of the Long Term Seismic Program (LTSP) hazard update, which is scheduled to be completed in 2011. PG&E Geosciences and their consultants will perform the majority of the work; as part of the CRADA, the USGS will perform the balance of their marine magnetic survey and evaluate additional seismicity data in the region.

Id., Section I at 1.[2]

In April 2009, the NRC Staff issued RIL-09-0001 for the purpose of describing PG&E's and the Staff's "Preliminary Deterministic Analyses of the Shoreline Fault." *Id.* at 1. The Staff explained that while the NRC is currently using probabilistic methods to license new reactors (*id.* at 3, citing 10 C.F.R. § 1000.23), it had used a deterministic approach to evaluate the safety implications of the Shoreline Fault "due to the limited and preliminary nature of the required

---

[1] The NRC considers the Hosgri fault to be the "controlling fault" for the DCPP design. RIL-09-0001 at 2.

[2] The NRC Staff noted its approval of the Action Plan in Memorandum to File from Alan Wang re: Diablo Canyon Power Plant Unit Nos. 1 and 2 – Review of Potential New Fault at the Diablo Canyon Power Plant Site (November 5, 2009) (ADAMS Accession No. ML093080508).

probabilistic input parameters." *Id.*[3] In addition, the Staff noted that a deterministic approach was "in keeping with the deterministic design basis for the facility. *Id.* (citing 10 C.F.R. Part 100, Appendix A).

Although RIL-09-0001 focused on PG&E's and the Staff's preliminary assessment of the Shoreline Fault with regard to the operability of DCPP, the Staff explained that in the future it intended to conduct probabilistic analyses of the information gathered under the CRADA program:

> The CRADA program is expected to provide significant new information regarding the larger tectonic picture of the area. The NRC staff's initial assessment was deterministic, consistent with the design basis of the facility. Currently, probabilistic methods are available to more accurately characterize the hazard of the region surrounding the site. Further, regional moment balancing could also more accurately characterize the regional hazard, both independently and as part of a probabilistic hazard assessment. *As more information becomes available (such as the slip rate of the potential Shoreline Fault or any additional information about the Hosgri Fault), the NRC staff expects to evaluate the regional seismic hazard and perform a probabilistic study, when the available data is sufficient.*

Id. at 10-11 (emphasis added).

On January 20, 2010, the NRC issued a report summarizing a January 5, 2010, meeting with PG&E regarding the Shoreline Fault. Summary of January 5, 2010, Meeting With Pacific Gas and Electric Company ("Meeting Summary") (ADAMS Accession No. ML100130753).

---

[3] RIL-09-0001 is rife with disclaimers about the preliminary nature of the information relied on the Staff for its operability analysis. For example, it:

- refers to PG&E's "preliminary assessment that the hazard potential of the Shoreline Fault is bounded by the current review ground motion spectrum for the facility." *Id.* at 1.
- refers to the "initial information provided by PG&E and the USGS." *Id.*
- states that "this work is based on the limited preliminary information currently available to the NRC Staff." *Id.*
- describes the PG&E-USGS investigation as "recently begun." *Id.* at 2.
- describes its interpretations of data as "preliminary." *Id.*
- States that although the quality of the preliminary data is "high" and the data sets provide a "consistent" picture, the picture is also "blurry." *Id.*

While both PG&E and the NRC Staff had previously referred to the Shoreline Fault as "potential" or "hypothetical," the Meeting Summary dropped those adjectives and referred to the fault as "newly identified." *Id.* at 1. The NRC Staff reported that the "Shoreline fault study" had "determined" that:

> 1. The microseismicity is a real feature,
>
> 2. The Shoreline fault zone has 3 segments,
>
> 3. The Shoreline fault is a vertical, strike-slip fault which is consistent with the earlier assumptions, and
>
> 4. The Shoreline fault is 300 meters from the intake structure and 600 meters from the power block as compared to the 1,000 meters previously assumed.

Id. at 1. The Staff reported its conclusion that this updated information had not changed its determination that the Hosgri fault is "bounding" with respect to the safety of operating DCPP. In addition, the Staff reported that PG&E had performed additional analysis showing that damage due to secondary faulting is "very unlikely and the impact on the DCPP seismic core damage frequency is negligible." *Id.* at 2.

Like the Action Plan, the Meeting Summary reported that under the "current schedule," PG&E would complete the Shoreline fault study by the end of 2010. *Id.* at 2. Reporting on the broader regional study that had commenced in 2007, the Meeting Summary stated that:

> The rest of the tectonic modeling for the central California region is due to be complete in 2012. Barbara Bryon (sic) from the California Energy Commission (CEC) asked if three-dimensional imaging studies as recommended by the CEC are going to be performed. PG&E stated it is looking into the funding for this project, and, if funded, would extend the central California study until 2013.

Id. at 1-2.

PG&E's SAMA analysis acknowledges that "both fire and seismic contributors" are "disproportionately dominant when compared to all external events." Environmental Report at

F-65. But nowhere in the SAMA analysis, including twenty pages of description of the Diablo Canyon PRA and its updates (*id.* at F-3 – F-23), does PG&E mention the Shoreline Fault or the Shoreline Fault study.

Elsewhere in the Environmental Report, PG&E does acknowledge the existence of the "potential" Shoreline Fault (*id.* at 5-2 and 5-4 – 5-5), but it does not discuss its own ongoing study of the fault. Instead, the discussion is limited to descriptions of PG&E's and the Staff's preliminary deterministic analyses in support of their operability determinations (*i.e.*, PG&E's "initial evaluation of the potential ground motion levels at DCPP from the hypothesized fault" and the NRC Staff's "preliminary independent review of possible implications of the potential Shoreline Fault to DCPP using the initial information provided by USGS through PG&E"). Environmental Report at 5-4. PG&E also mentions that "PG&E has been collaborating with the USGS to collect and analyze new geological, geophysical, and seismic data to develop improved tectonic models for the central California coastal region through the Collaborative Research and Development Agreement" (id. at 5-4) -- but never acknowledges that the collaborative study was accelerated and re-focused on the Shoreline Fault or that PG&E has an NRC-approved Action Plan for completing the study.

b. Discussion

NRC regulation 10 C.F.R. § 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(L) requires that PG&E must address alternatives for mitigating severe accidents or "SAMAs" in its Environmental Report. CEQ regulation 40 C.F.R. § 1502.22 also requires that where information is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives, the Environmental Report must be based on information that is complete, or its absence must be acknowledged and justified. Only if the "overall costs" of obtaining information are "exorbitant" can PG&E omit essential information. *Id.*

PG&E's SAMA analysis is inadequate to satisfy NEPA or its implementing regulations because PG&E's consideration of severe accident mitigation alternatives is based on incomplete information about earthquake risks at Diablo Canyon, and because PG&E fails to acknowledge that it can obtain complete information by simply waiting for the completion of the information.

PG&E appears to believe that it could lawfully rely on its preliminary and deterministic operability analysis to eliminate the Shoreline Fault from any consideration in its SAMA analysis. Setting aside the question of whether PG&E's operability analysis was legally sufficient under the Atomic Energy to ensure the protection of public safety during DCPP's ongoing operation, the NRC's standard for SAMA analyses is quite different: PRA is the "accepted and standard practice in SAMA analyses." *Entergy Nuclear Generation Company and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.* (Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station), LBP-06-23, 64 NRC 257, 340 (2006). In addition, the information collected by PG&E to date is concededly preliminary. Thus, information sufficient to conduct a probabilistic analysis of the risks posed by the Shoreline Fault is "essential" to the SAMA, and must be included unless the cost is exorbitant. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.22. In this case, the only cost of obtaining the information is the cost of waiting for completion of the Shoreline Fault study – which has been planned by PG&E since 2008.[4] PG&E does not address the cost of waiting for completion of those studies in the Environmental Report, and therefore fails to comply with 40 C.F.R. § 1502.22(b).

In any event, no justification can be found for PG&E's decision not to await the information. As discussed above, completion of the Shoreline Fault study is scheduled for the end of 2010, and PG&E plans to update its probabilistic LTSP with that information in 2011.

---

[4] As discussed in the Action Plan, PG&E plans to finish the Shoreline Fault study in 2010 and prepare a probabilistic analysis of the Shoreline Fault in 2011. In RIL-09-0001, the Staff does not provide a date for its own probabilistic analysis, but states that it will do so "when the data is sufficient."

Tectonic modeling and three-dimensional modeling, is scheduled for completion by 2013. Thus it appears that all of the information needed by PG&E to conduct a probabilistic evaluation of the risk of an earthquake in light of the Shoreline Fault will be available by 2013 at the latest. Given that 2013 is more than ten years before PG&E's licenses are due to expire in 2024 and 2025, PG&E has ample time to conduct a SAMA analysis that is based on complete seismic information.[5] Moreover, as the California Public Utilities Commission ("CPUC") has recognized, it makes no economic sense to rush through a license renewal proceeding without adequate information on seismic risks. As stated by the President of the CPUC, PG&E's decision not to include a rigorous and up-to-date seismic study in its license renewal application:

> does not allow the CPUC to properly undertake its AB 1632 [California Energy Commission's study, *An Assessment of California's Nuclear Power Plants: AB1632 Report*] obligations to ensure plant reliability, and in turn to ensure grid reliability, in the event Diablo Canyon has a prolonged or permanent outage.

Letter from CPUC President Michael R. Peevey to PG&E President and CEO Peter A. Darbee (June 25, 2009) (copy attached as Exhibit 2). In other words, as CPUC correctly observes, the cost of going forward with an inadequate SAMA analysis is far greater than the cost of waiting until complete information is available.

3. Demonstration that the Contention is Within the Scope of the Proceeding: This contention is within the scope of this proceeding because it relates to the SAMA analysis required by NRC regulations for the re-licensing of Diablo Canyon.

4. Demonstration that the Contention is Material to the Findings NRC Must Make to Re-License Diablo Canyon: The contention is material to the findings the NRC must make

---

[5] The schedules posted on the NRC's webpage for license renewal show that the NRC has not completed any contested license renewal case that lasted more than four years, and the two pending license renewal cases that have now been completed to the stage of Commission review – Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee – have not taken more than four years to reach the Commission review stage. *See* http://www.nrc.gov/reactors/operating/licensing/renewal/applications.html

to re-license Diablo Canyon because it demonstrates a deficiency in PG&E's Environmental Report which, if left uncured, will undermine the NRC's ability to adequately evaluate measures to mitigate the adverse impacts of severe accidents at DCNPP.

5. Concise Statement of the Facts or Expert Opinion Supporting the Contention, Along With Appropriate Citations to Supporting Scientific or Factual Materials: This contention is based on facts and opinions stated in documents issued by PG&E, the NRC Staff, and the State of California, which are cited in paragraph 2 above.

Contention EC–2: Failure of SAMA Analysis to Address Environmental Impacts of Spent Fuel Pool Accidents

1. Statement of Contention: PG&E's Environmental Report is inadequate to satisfy NEPA because it does not address the airborne environmental impacts of a reasonably foreseeable spectrum of spent fuel pool accidents, including accidents caused by earthquakes.

2. Brief Summary of Basis for the Contention: In its Environmental Report, PG&E omits any discussion of spent fuel storage impacts because it is a Category 1 issue that was addressed in the 1996 GEIS. Environmental Report at 4-1. Therefore the license renewal GEIS is the appropriate focus of this contention.

In the 1996 License Renewal GEIS, the NRC asserts, with very little discussion, that the environmental impacts of spent fuel storage are small. *Id.* at 6-83. The 2009 Draft Revised License Renewal GEIS updates the 1996 License Renewal GEIS by addressing additional analyses performed since 1996. *Id.*, § E.3.7, page E-32 – E-37. According to the Draft Revised License Renewal GEIS, the "key document in this regard" is NUREG-1738, *Technical Study of Spent Fuel Pool Accident Risk at Decommissioning Nuclear Power Plants* (October 2000), which examines a range of accident initiating events. *Id.* at E-33 – E-34. These initiating events include seismic events, cask drop, loss of offsite power, internal fire, loss of pool cooling, loss of pool coolant inventory, accidental aircraft impact, and tornado missile. *Id.* Relying on NUREG-1738, the Draft Revised License Renewal GEIS concludes that the health-related environmental impacts of a spent fuel pool accident would be comparable to or lower than the impacts of a reactor accident and are bounded by the 1996 GEIS.

Concededly, however, neither the Draft Revised License Renewal GEIS nor NUREG-1738 addresses spent fuel pool accidents outside the eastern and central United States. *Id.* at E-33. Moreover, Diablo Canyon is specifically excluded. *Id.*, note 1. As explained in NUREG-1738, western nuclear reactor sites like Diablo Canyon "would need to be considered on a site-specific basis because of important differences in seismically induced failure potential of the SFPs [spent fuel pools]." *Id.* at ix. This conclusion is consistent with PG&E's SAMA analysis for Diablo Canyon, which states that while it is generally reasonable to conclude that the risk of external and internal events are "approximately equal," seismic accident risk contributors (along with fire) are "disproportionately dominant" when compared to all external events. *Id.* at F-65.

In the Draft Revised License Renewal GEIS, the NRC amends NUREG-1738 by stating that recent and "more rigorous accident progression analyses," "mitigation enhancements," and "NRC site evaluations of every SFP in the United States" have led it to conclude that "the risk of an SFP zirconium fire initiation is expected to be less than reported in NUREG-1738 . . . and previous studies." *Id.* at E-36. Given that the risk evaluation in NUREG-1738 does not apply to Diablo Canyon, however, this assertion has no meaningful application to Diablo Canyon. And nothing else in the Draft Revised License Renewal GEIS indicates that the NRC has re-evaluated the conclusions of NUREG-1738 in light of the seismic risks at Diablo Canyon.[6]

As stated in NUREG-1738, if a spent fuel pool fire occurred at Diablo Canyon, it "could result in high consequences in terms of property damage and land contamination." *Id.* at A6-26. The effects of a pool fire also include the societal and economic impacts of relocating large numbers of people: indeed, NUREG-1738's conclusion that latent fatalities would be relatively low is based on the presumption that the people in the area of a nuclear plant will be evacuated and relocated after a pool fire. *Id.* at A4C-4. The economic consequences of a pool fire could be particularly high for California as the highest-earning agricultural state in the union.[7] While it may be possible to relocate people, schools and businesses, it is not possible to relocate fertile farmland. These potential consequences are not discussed in the Environmental Report or any other existing EIS for license renewal.

In order to comply with NEPA, the Environmental Report should contain a complete analysis of the potential for a pool fire at Diablo Canyon. The analysis should consider a full spectrum of potential causes, including seismic contributors. As discussed in Contention EC-3, intentional attacks on the fuel pool should also be included in the spectrum of considered events.

---

[6] The Draft Revised License Renewal GEIS does not state that the "NRC site evaluations of every SFP in the United States" included an evaluation of earthquake risks to the spent fuel storage pools at Diablo Canyon. Indeed, the content of the site evaluation for Diablo Canyon cannot be determined at all because the Draft Revised License Renewal GEIS provides no citation to any site evaluation for Diablo Canyon or any other reactor.

[7] *See* 2007 Census of Agriculture – State Data (http://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2007/Full_Report/Volume_1,_Chapter_2_US_State_Level/st99_2_002_002.pdf), which shows that 2007 total farm sales in California were over $33 billion, more than 10% of the total farm sales in the entire United States of $297 billion. In the same year, average farm income in California was $418,164, more than three times the national average of $134,807. A copy of the California census data is attached as Exhibit 3.

The Environmental Report should also provide a complete analysis of the consequences, including not only health effects but economic and societal effects of widespread land contamination and the need to relocate the population. The Environmental Report should address those impacts, including the health, societal and economic impacts of long-term radiological contamination. In addition, the Environmental Report should address alternatives for avoiding or mitigating those impacts, including the no-action alternative.

3. Demonstration that the Contention is Within the Scope of the Proceeding: This contention is within the scope of the Diablo Canyon license renewal proceeding because it seeks consideration, in the Environmental Report, of information regarding the potentially significant environmental impacts of spent fuel pool accidents that is not considered in the 1996 License Renewal GEIS, that has been identified as new and significant information in the Draft Revised License Renewal GEIS, and that is concededly not generic in nature. Nevertheless, because NRC regulations excuse PG&E from considering the environmental impacts of spent fuel storage in this proceeding, SLOMFP seeks a waiver of those regulations. *See* attached San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace's Petition for Waiver of 10 C.F.R. Part 51 Subpart A Appendix B and 10 C.F.R. § 51.53(c)(2) (March 22, 2010) ("Waiver Petition").

4. Demonstration that the Contention is Material to the Findings NRC Must Make to Re-License Diablo Canyon: The contention is material to the findings NRC must make regarding the environmental impacts of re-licensing the Diablo Canyon nuclear power plant and a reasonable array of alternative measures to avoid or mitigate those impacts, including the no-action alternative. As discussed in the attached Waiver Petition, while the NRC previously made a generic finding about the environmental impacts of spent fuel storage, in this case it is appropriate to make a site-specific finding.

5. Concise Statement of the Facts or Expert Opinion Supporting the Contention, Along With Appropriate Citations to Supporting Scientific or Factual Materials: This contention is based on factual information contained in the Environmental Report, NRC documents, and U.S. census data as cited in paragraph 2 above.

Contention EC-3: Failure to Address Environmental Impacts of an Attack on the Diablo Canyon Spent Fuel Pool

1. Statement of contention: The Environmental Report fails to satisfy NEPA because it does not evaluate the environmental impacts of an attack on the Diablo Canyon spent fuel pool during the operating license renewal term.

2. Brief statement of basis for the contention: In the Environmental Report, PG&E does not discuss the environmental impacts of spent fuel storage but instead relies on the 1996 License Renewal GEIS and related regulations. Environmental Report at 4-1. Therefore the GEIS is the appropriate focus of this contention.

As discussed above in Contention EC-2, the Draft Revised GEIS contains significant new information about the risks of spent fuel storage which was not previously considered in the 1996 License Renewal GEIS. While the NRC continues to assert that spent fuel storage impacts are low, it does so based on analyses and mitigation measures that it has never mentioned before. Mitigation measures relied on by NRC for its conclusion include "mitigation enhancements" and "NRC site evaluations of every SFP in the United States." *Id.* at E-36. Thus, to some extent, the NRC appears to be relying on site-specific analyses and mitigation measures to reduce the environmental impacts of spent fuel pool attacks. Unfortunately, the NRC does not provide any citations to these references, and thus it is impossible to determine what exactly they consist of.

As required by the Commission in *Pacific Gas and Electric Company* (Diablo Canyon Power Plant Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation), CLI-08-1, 67 NRC 1, 14-16 (2008), the NRC must provide identifying information for all reference documents on which it relies, including references to both site-specific and generic analyses and mitigation measures; and it should disclose those portions that are releasable. Assuming those documents confirm that the NRC did indeed rely on site-specific measures for its evaluation of the impacts of attacks on the DCNPP spent fuel pool and appropriate mitigation measures, the Commission should also waive its regulations to permit a site-specific evaluation of the environmental impacts of an attack on the Diablo Canyon spent fuel pool.

3. Demonstration that the Contention is Within the Scope of the Proceeding: This contention is within the scope of the Diablo Canyon license renewal proceeding because it seeks consideration, in the Environmental Report, of information regarding the potentially significant environmental impacts of spent fuel pool accidents that is not considered in the 1996 License Renewal GEIS, that has been identified as new and significant information in the Draft Revised License Renewal GEIS, and that is concededly not generic in nature. Nevertheless, because NRC regulations excuse PG&E from considering the environmental impacts of spent fuel storage in this proceeding, SLOMFP seeks a waiver of those regulations. *See* attached Waiver Petition.

4. Demonstration that the Contention is Material to the Findings NRC Must Make to Re-License Diablo Canyon: The contention is material to the findings NRC must make regarding the environmental impacts of re-licensing the Diablo Canyon nuclear power plant and a reasonable array of alternative measures to avoid or mitigate those impacts, including the no-action alternative. As discussed in the attached Waiver Petition, while the NRC previously made a generic finding about the environmental impacts of spent fuel storage, in this case it is appropriate to make a site-specific finding.

5. Concise Statement of the Facts or Expert Opinion Supporting the Contention, Along With Appropriate Citations to Supporting Scientific or Factual Materials: This contention is based on factual information contained in the Environmental Report, the 1996 License Renewal GEIS and the Draft Revised License Renewal GEIS, as discussed and cited in paragraph 2 above.

Contention EC-4: Failure to Address Environmental Impacts of Attack on Diablo Canyon reactor

1. Statement of Contention: The Environmental Report fails to satisfy the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) because it does not discuss the cost-effectiveness of measures to mitigate the environmental impacts of an attack on the Diablo Canyon reactor during the license renewal term.

2. Brief Summary of Basis for the Contention: The NRC has conceded that, for reactors located in the Ninth Circuit of the U.S. Court of Appeals, it must address the environmental impacts of an attack on any facility it proposes to re-license. Draft GEIS at E-6 - E-8 (citing *San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace v. NRC*). In its Environmental Report, PG&E relies on an analysis of the impacts of attacks that is presented in the Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS) for License Renewal. Environmental Report at 5-5. *See also id.* at F-83. According to PG&E, the GEIS is sufficient to address the impacts of a terrorist attack on Diablo Canyon because it concluded that if an attack were to occur, "the Commission would expect that the resultant core damage and radiological releases would be no worse than those expected from internally initiated events." *Id.* (quoting License Renewal GEIS without a page citation).

The discussion in the License Renewal GEIS that is cited by PG&E is completely inadequate to satisfy NEPA, however, because it does not include any analysis of the relative costs and benefits of measures to avoid or mitigate the effects of an attack. A discussion of mitigative measures is required by NEPA and by NRC regulations that require the analysis of severe accident mitigation alternatives (SAMAs) in license renewal decisions. 10 C.F.R. § 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(L). Just as mitigative measures are specific to the types of severe accidents to which a particular reactor design and site are vulnerable, they are also specific to the types of attacks to which the particular reactor design and site are vulnerable.

3. Demonstration that the Contention is Within the Scope of the Proceeding: The contention is within the scope of the proceeding because (a) the Ninth Circuit's decision in *San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace* established that the impacts of attacks on the Diablo Canyon reactor are cognizable under NEPA, (b) an evaluation of mitigation measures is required by NEPA and NRC regulations, and (c) an evaluation of measures to mitigate attacks on nuclear reactors cannot be found in the License Renewal GEIS.

4. Demonstration that the Contention is Material to the Findings NRC Must Make to Re-License Diablo Canyon: The contention is material to the findings NRC must make in order to re-license Diablo Canyon because it demonstrates the absence of legal and factual analyses that are required by NEPA before the NRC may renew the license.

5. Concise Statement of the Facts or Expert Opinion Supporting the Contention, Along With Appropriate Citations to Supporting Scientific or Factual Materials: This contention relies on factual information presented in the Environmental Report and the Draft Revised License Renewal GEIS, as discussed in paragraph 2 above.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, SLOMFP should be granted intervenor status and its contentions should be admitted.

Respectfully submitted,

Electronically signed by
Diane Curran
Harmon, Curran, Spielberg, & Eisenberg, L.L.P.
1726 M Street N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/328-3500
e-mail: dcurran@harmoncurran.com

March 22, 2010

Exhibit 1A

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
BEFORE THE SECRETARY OF THE COMMISSION

In the matter
of
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant
Docket Nos. 50-275 and 50-323
Units Nos. 1 and 2
Renewal of Operating Licenses

DECLARATION OF Elizabeth Apfelberg

Under penalty of perjury, I, Elizabeth Apfelberg, declare as follows:

1. My name is Elizabeth Apfelberg,I live at 86 Los Palos Drive, San Luis Obispo, California. My home lies within 20 miles of Diablo Canyon nuclear power plant (DCNPP).

2. I am a member of San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace (SLOMFP).

3. I am concerned that the renewed operation of DCNPP will jeopardize the health and safety of myself and my family, and decrease the value of our property. I am also concerned that the operation of DCNPP will have an adverse effect on the health of the environment in which I live.

5. Therefore, I have authorized SLOMFP to request a hearing and intervene on my behalf in the license renewal proceeding for DCNPP.

Elizabeth E Apfelberg
NAME

Dated: March 9, 2010

Exhibit 1B

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
BEFORE THE SECRETARY OF THE COMMISSION

In the matter of

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant   Docket Nos. 50-275 and 50-323

Units Nos. 1 and 2
Renewal of Operating Licenses

DECLARATION OF ELAINE E. HOLDER

Under penalty of perjury, I, Elaine E. Holder, declare as follows:

1. My name is Elaine E. Holder. I live at 274 Cuesta Drive, San Luis Obispo, CA 93405. My home lies within 11 miles of Diablo Canyon nuclear power plant (DCNPP). I also own a house at1166 Nice Ave, Grover Beach, CA 93433, which lies within 11 miles of Diablo Canyon.

2. I am a member of San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace (SLOMFP).

3. I am concerned that the renewed operation of DCNPP will jeopardize my health and safety, and the value of my property. I am also concerned that the operation of DCNPP will have an adverse effect on the health of the environment in which I live. Because I am 83 and I do not drive, I am also concerned about evacuation plans.

5. Therefore, I have authorized SLOMFP to request a hearing and intervene on my behalf in the license renewal proceeding for DCNPP.

Elaine E. Holder
NAME

* See CA Notary Attachment

Dated: March 8, 2010

Exhibit 1C

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
BEFORE THE SECRETARY OF THE COMMISSION

In the matter of

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant
Units Nos. 1 and 2
Renewal of Operating Licenses

Docket Nos. 50-275 and 50-323

DECLARATION OF Lucy Jane Swanson

Under penalty of perjury, I, Lucy Jane Swanson, declare as follows:

1. My name is Lucy Jane Swanson. I live at 475 Squire Canyon Road, San Luis Obispo, California. My home lies within 15 miles of Diablo Canyon nuclear power plant (DCNPP).

2. I am a member of San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace (SLOMFP).

3. I am concerned that the renewed operation of DCNPP will jeopardize the health and safety of myself and my family, and the value of our property. I am also concerned that the operation of DCNPP will have an adverse effect on the health of the environment in which I live.

5. Therefore, I have authorized SLOMFP to request a hearing and to intervene on my behalf in the license renewal proceeding for DCNPP.

Lucy Jane Swanson
NAME

Dated: March 9, 2010

Exhibit 1D

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
BEFORE THE SECRETARY OF THE COMMISSION

In the matter of

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant
Units Nos. 1 and 2
Renewal of Operating Licenses

Docket Nos. 50-275 and 50-323

DECLARATION OF Jill ZamEk

Under penalty of perjury, I, Jill ZamEk, declare as follows:

1. My name is Jill ZamEk. I live at 1123 Flora Road, Arroyo Grande, CA. My home lies within 25 miles of Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant (DCNPP).

2. I am a member and Board Member of San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace (SLOMFP).

3. I am concerned that the renewed operation of DCNPP will jeopardize the health and safety of myself and my family, and the value of our property. I am also concerned that the operation of DCNPP will have an adverse effect on the health of the environment in which I live.

5. Therefore, I have authorized SLOMFP to request a hearing and intervene on my behalf in the license renewal proceeding for DCNPP.

Jill ZamEk
Signature

3/11/10
Date

Please see California Notary ~~Acknowledgment~~ w/ Jurat attached.

Exhibit 2

June 25, 2009

Mr. Peter A. Darbee
President & Chief Executive Officer
Pacific Gas & Electric Company
1 Market, Spear Tower, Suite 2400
San Francisco, CA 94105

Dear Mr. Darbee:

As required by Assembly Bill (AB) 1632 (Blakeslee), the Energy Commission completed a comprehensive assessment of Diablo Canyon and San Onofre and adopted the study, *"An Assessment of California's Nuclear Power Plants: AB1632 Report"* (AB 1632 Report) as part of its 2008 Integrated Energy Policy Report (IEPR). This AB 1632 study recommended that the CPUC take certain steps to ensure plant reliability when we review PG&E's license renewal feasibility study for Diablo Canyon. In particular, we need to ensure that we thoroughly evaluate the overall economic and environmental costs and benefits of a license extension for Diablo Canyon─especially in light of the facility's geographic location vis-à-vis seismic hazard and vulnerability assessment. As part of this evaluation, PG&E should report on its progress in implementing the AB 1632 Report's recommendation on Diablo Canyon. The CPUC will be looking to the Energy Commission's IEPR for information and input to its license renewal decisions for Diablo Canyon.

It has come to my attention that PG&E does not believe that it should include a seismic study, and other AB 1632 Report recommended studies, as part of its Diablo Canyon license extension studies for the CPUC. Apparently, PG&E bases this position on the fact that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC) license renewal application review process does not require that such a study be included within the scope of a license extension application.

That position, however, does not allow the CPUC to properly undertake its AB 1632 obligations to ensure plant reliability, and in turn to ensure grid reliability, in the event Diablo Canyon has a prolonged or permanent outage. Therefore, the Commission directs PG&E to perform the following tasks as part of its license renewal feasibility studies for Diablo Canyon:

1. Report on the major findings and conclusions from Diablo Canyon's seismic/tsunami studies, as recommended in the AB 1632 Report (pp. 6, 7, 10 and 13), as well as studies that are directed by any subsequent legislative mandates,

and report on the implications of these findings and conclusions for the long-term seismic vulnerability and reliability of the plant.

2. Summarize the lessons learned from the Kashiwazaki-Kariwa plant experience in response to the 2007 earthquake and discuss the implications that an earthquake of the same, or greater, magnitude could have on Diablo Canyon. In particular, the Commission needs PG&E to evaluate whether there are any additional pre-planning or mitigation steps that the utility could take for the power plant that could minimize plant outage times following a major seismic event.
3. Reassess the adequacy of access roads to the Diablo Canyon plant and surrounding roadways for allowing emergency personnel to reach the plants and local communities and plant workers to evacuate. This assessment needs to consider today's local population and not rely on the situation extant when the plant was constructed.
4. Conduct a detailed study of the local economic impacts that would result from a shut-down of the nuclear plant and compare that impact with alternate uses of the Diablo Canyon site.
5. Assess low-level waste disposal costs for waste generated through a 20-year plant license extension, including the low-level waste disposal costs for any major capital projects that might be required during this period. In addition, PG&E should include its plans for storage and disposal of low-level waste and spent fuel through decommissioning of the Diablo Canyon plant as well as the cost associated with the storage and disposal.
6. Study alternative power generation options to quantify the reliability, economic and environmental impacts of replacement power options.
7. Include PG&E's responses to nuclear-related data requests and recommendations in future IEPRs.

PG&E's rate case, D. 07-03-044, specifically linked PG&E's license renewal feasibility study for Diablo Canyon to the AB 1632 assessment and PG&E is obligated to address the above itemized issues in its plant relicensing application. This commission will not be able to adequately and appropriately exercise its authority to fund and oversee Diablo Canyon's license extension without these AB 1632 issues being fully developed.

Sincerely,

Michael R. Peevey
President
California Public Utilities Commission

Exhibit 3

Table 2. **Market Value of Agricultural Products Sold Including Direct Sales: 2007 and 2002**

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	United States	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California
Total sales (see text) farms, 2007	2,204,792	48,753	686	15,637	49,346	81,033
2002	2,128,982	45,126	609	7,294	47,483	79,631
$1,000, 2007	297,220,491	4,415,550	57,019	3,234,552	7,508,806	33,885,064
2002	200,646,355	3,264,949	46,143	2,395,447	4,950,397	25,737,173
Average per farm dollars, 2007	134,807	90,570	83,119	206,852	152,166	418,164
2002	94,245	72,352	75,768	328,413	104,256	323,205
2007 value of sales:						
Less than $1,000 (see text) farms	688,833	17,042	143	7,266	12,814	18,111
$1,000	84,357	2,040	17	1,103	1,735	2,219
$1,000 to $2,499 farms	211,494	5,540	88	2,366	4,996	5,854
$1,000	350,588	9,198	140	3,682	8,390	9,652
$2,500 to $4,999 farms	200,302	5,458	81	1,721	5,353	6,548
$1,000	718,027	19,369	279	5,975	19,279	23,510
$5,000 to $9,999 farms	218,531	5,702	91	1,377	6,263	7,208
$1,000	1,552,543	40,413	628	9,415	44,563	51,093
$10,000 to $19,999 farms	190,402	5,217	72	862	5,576	7,761
$1,000	2,682,120	72,543	969	11,632	77,750	108,885
$20,000 to $24,999 farms	57,883	1,240	19	201	1,571	2,720
$1,000	1,277,703	27,238	413	4,413	34,598	59,120
$25,000 to $39,999 farms	107,046	1,895	49	307	2,278	5,081
$1,000	3,367,661	58,808	1,505	9,542	70,441	158,823
$40,000 to $49,999 farms	47,686	643	19	126	740	2,497
$1,000	2,112,835	28,145	831	5,531	32,541	108,929
$50,000 to $99,999 farms	125,456	1,287	47	358	1,685	6,212
$1,000	8,961,255	89,616	3,251	25,023	116,773	435,855
$100,000 to $249,999 farms	147,500	1,003	40	298	1,587	6,544
$1,000	24,212,940	164,905	5,901	47,690	267,171	1,026,860
$250,000 to $499,999 farms	93,373	1,386	18	204	1,884	3,917
$1,000	33,409,883	536,916	6,246	74,022	702,517	1,361,005
$500,000 or more farms	116,286	2,340	19	551	4,599	8,580
$1,000	218,490,577	3,366,360	36,839	3,036,525	6,133,048	30,539,114
2002 value of sales:						
Less than $1,000 (see text) farms	570,919	13,298	127	2,538	9,750	16,529
$1,000	63,223	1,680	19	259	1,387	1,872
$1,000 to $2,499 farms	255,639	6,260	80	907	6,658	6,833
$1,000	422,136	10,453	119	1,543	11,104	11,130
$2,500 to $4,999 farms	213,326	6,428	59	647	5,975	6,038
$1,000	762,554	23,068	201	2,308	21,479	21,417
$5,000 to $9,999 farms	223,168	6,083	96	598	6,237	7,262
$1,000	1,577,184	42,770	660	4,248	43,808	50,730
$10,000 to $19,999 farms	197,967	4,203	65	491	5,023	7,169
$1,000	2,781,507	58,176	916	6,752	69,165	101,385
$20,000 to $24,999 farms	58,190	1,003	24	184	1,285	2,286
$1,000	1,285,921	22,113	529	4,029	28,134	50,081
$25,000 to $39,999 farms	109,310	1,425	31	310	1,581	4,957
$1,000	3,438,976	44,272	941	9,810	49,138	155,635
$40,000 to $49,999 farms	48,596	509	22	120	595	2,174
$1,000	2,154,772	22,526	982	5,244	26,226	95,767
$50,000 to $99,999 farms	140,479	1,246	34	307	1,865	6,798
$1,000	10,024,295	86,863	2,282	22,066	135,583	478,765
$100,000 to $249,999 farms	159,052	1,280	33	320	2,655	7,281
$1,000	25,401,608	212,895	5,210	49,562	447,409	1,146,367
$250,000 to $499,999 farms	81,694	1,441	23	232	3,120	4,145
$1,000	28,530,105	529,623	8,308	82,714	1,177,094	1,455,208
$500,000 or more farms	70,642	1,950	15	640	2,739	8,159
$1,000	124,204,073	2,210,510	25,977	2,206,913	2,939,871	22,168,817
Value of sales by commodity or commodity group:						
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse farms, 2007	986,080	13,681	384	4,513	15,966	48,901
2002	944,656	11,059	337	2,576	12,995	48,634
$1,000, 2007	143,657,928	676,987	24,749	1,913,014	2,900,973	22,903,021
2002	95,151,954	590,268	20,543	1,587,775	1,620,384	19,152,722
Grains, oilseeds, dry beans, and dry peas farms, 2007	479,467	2,359	21	434	5,220	4,261
2002	485,124	2,195	23	485	5,971	4,952
$1,000, 2007	77,215,262	120,656	587	117,494	2,252,907	1,105,369
2002	39,957,698	62,949	(D)	80,408	1,122,883	722,093
Corn farms, 2007	347,540	1,856	-	156	1,411	1,811
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	39,909,600	74,138	-	40,187	356,930	309,402
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Wheat farms, 2007	159,527	518	-	200	2,112	1,188
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	10,623,640	13,680	-	46,107	118,354	155,566
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Soybeans farms, 2007	285,089	924	-	-	4,711	15
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	20,283,986	29,511	-	-	769,976	326
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Sorghum farms, 2007	27,142	88	-	130	707	150
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	1,651,798	801	-	15,167	73,348	7,909
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Barley farms, 2007	18,326	-	19	113	-	160
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	701,047	-	497	11,115	-	11,146
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Rice farms, 2007	6,085	-	-	-	2,752	1,305
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	2,020,231	-	-	-	932,782	501,046
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Other grains, oilseeds, dry beans, and dry peas farms, 2007	55,228	275	5	72	62	967
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	2,024,959	2,526	90	4,917	1,516	119,976
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)

See footnote(s) at end of table.

--continued

Table 2. **Market Value of Agricultural Products Sold Including Direct Sales: 2007 and 2002** - Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Hawaii
Total sales (see text) ....farms, 2007	37,054	4,916	2,546	47,463	47,846	7,521
2002	31,369	4,191	2,391	44,081	49,311	5,398
$1,000, 2007	6,061,134	551,553	1,083,035	7,785,228	7,112,866	513,626
2002	4,525,196	470,637	618,853	6,242,272	4,911,752	533,423
Average per farm ....dollars, 2007	163,576	112,195	425,387	164,027	148,662	68,292
2002	144,257	112,297	258,826	141,609	99,608	98,819
2007 value of sales:						
Less than $1,000 (see text) ....farms	14,235	1,307	433	16,150	18,405	1,646
$1,000	1,457	246	66	1,999	2,033	299
$1,000 to $2,499 ....farms	3,331	626	250	5,379	4,986	1,286
$1,000	5,382	1,038	406	8,840	8,228	2,032
$2,500 to $4,999 ....farms	3,002	719	201	4,839	4,450	1,012
$1,000	10,597	2,453	709	17,331	16,014	3,588
$5,000 to $9,999 ....farms	3,122	561	159	4,668	4,527	996
$1,000	21,896	3,886	1,154	32,863	31,999	7,048
$10,000 to $19,999 ....farms	2,749	499	216	4,093	3,860	939
$1,000	38,794	6,959	2,997	57,225	53,584	12,962
$20,000 to $24,999 ....farms	851	153	56	1,311	1,046	204
$1,000	18,768	3,383	1,233	28,538	23,011	4,418
$25,000 to $39,999 ....farms	1,628	228	100	2,301	1,651	401
$1,000	51,246	7,026	2,968	71,667	51,361	12,480
$40,000 to $49,999 ....farms	755	101	27	1,054	657	156
$1,000	33,349	4,424	1,209	45,631	29,145	6,716
$50,000 to $99,999 ....farms	2,283	231	115	2,435	1,491	353
$1,000	162,360	16,111	8,056	170,114	103,044	24,332
$100,000 to $249,999 ....farms	2,348	222	140	2,103	2,182	274
$1,000	378,950	35,505	23,150	331,134	378,793	40,897
$250,000 to $499,999 ....farms	1,247	91	141	1,063	1,232	106
$1,000	450,488	31,071	52,303	373,432	459,611	37,691
$500,000 or more ....farms	1,503	178	708	2,067	3,359	148
$1,000	4,887,846	439,451	988,785	6,646,454	5,956,045	361,164
2002 value of sales:						
Less than $1,000 (see text) ....farms	9,429	1,312	324	12,027	17,108	661
$1,000	777	177	66	1,564	1,671	165
$1,000 to $2,499 ....farms	3,587	588	283	7,087	6,878	746
$1,000	5,813	949	475	11,404	11,370	1,207
$2,500 to $4,999 ....farms	2,979	523	141	4,544	5,046	714
$1,000	10,545	1,797	479	16,093	17,996	2,549
$5,000 to $9,999 ....farms	2,967	398	133	4,285	5,131	916
$1,000	20,955	2,751	876	30,120	36,111	6,366
$10,000 to $19,999 ....farms	2,882	379	120	3,910	3,881	807
$1,000	40,344	5,294	1,688	55,050	54,211	11,035
$20,000 to $24,999 ....farms	896	123	39	1,330	997	249
$1,000	19,647	2,713	865	29,469	22,063	5,346
$25,000 to $39,999 ....farms	1,725	170	93	2,227	1,702	341
$1,000	54,476	5,252	2,914	70,153	53,332	10,519
$40,000 to $49,999 ....farms	795	71	54	1,078	704	165
$1,000	35,098	3,092	2,365	47,857	30,950	7,109
$50,000 to $99,999 ....farms	2,179	188	180	2,486	1,592	314
$1,000	154,391	13,160	12,581	175,907	112,269	20,907
$100,000 to $249,999 ....farms	2,064	195	195	2,092	1,804	249
$1,000	322,541	32,391	31,975	328,219	297,953	37,734
$250,000 to $499,999 ....farms	867	114	499	1,147	1,997	103
$1,000	299,380	37,906	196,263	395,446	734,621	36,198
$500,000 or more ....farms	999	130	330	1,868	2,471	133
$1,000	3,561,229	365,155	368,306	5,080,991	3,539,204	394,287
Value of sales by commodity or commodity group:						
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse ....farms, 2007	13,897	2,937	1,517	17,307	15,305	5,376
2002	10,613	2,376	1,366	17,327	14,837	4,317
$1,000, 2007	1,981,399	401,372	210,635	6,256,228	2,142,270	429,916
2002	1,216,278	327,527	150,404	5,041,433	1,579,596	445,356
Grains, oilseeds, dry beans, and dry peas ....farms, 2007	5,304	157	1,098	730	4,422	15
2002	4,829	116	1,014	509	3,828	13
$1,000, 2007	1,049,754	2,316	117,073	33,344	300,754	19,353
2002	448,378	1,410	72,393	17,798	102,464	14,647
Corn ....farms, 2007	2,926	142	855	555	3,190	15
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	487,703	2,182	67,837	17,583	178,260	19,353
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Wheat ....farms, 2007	3,649	3	339	79	1,318	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	435,716	(D)	14,661	2,988	45,390	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Soybeans ....farms, 2007	67	7	830	117	1,653	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	3,261	(D)	31,079	2,349	61,703	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Sorghum ....farms, 2007	418	1	10	37	448	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	21,707	(D)	(D)	671	6,569	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Barley ....farms, 2007	326	-	137	-	11	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	24,066	-	3,319	-	80	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Rice ....farms, 2007	-	-	-	7	-	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	-	-	-	8,332	-	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Other grains, oilseeds, dry beans, and dry peas ....farms, 2007	1,248	18	23	141	914	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	77,301	29	(D)	1,421	8,751	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)

See footnote(s) at end of table. --continued

Table 2. **Market Value of Agricultural Products Sold Including Direct Sales: 2007 and 2002** - Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Idaho	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky
Total sales (see text) ....farms, 2007	25,349	76,860	60,938	92,856	65,531	85,260
2002	25,017	73,027	60,296	90,655	64,414	86,541
$1,000, 2007	5,688,765	13,329,107	8,271,291	20,418,096	14,413,182	4,824,561
2002	3,908,262	7,676,239	4,783,158	12,273,634	8,746,244	3,080,080
Average per farm ....dollars, 2007	224,418	173,421	135,733	219,890	219,944	56,586
2002	156,224	105,115	79,328	135,388	135,782	35,591
2007 value of sales:						
Less than $1,000 (see text) .... farms	8,089	22,411	17,258	23,698	18,554	25,918
$1,000	958	2,051	2,300	1,292	1,578	3,805
$1,000 to $2,499 .... farms	2,683	4,468	5,212	3,032	4,177	9,882
$1,000	4,467	7,486	8,760	5,079	6,871	16,482
$2,500 to $4,999 .... farms	2,192	4,278	4,971	3,986	3,863	9,787
$1,000	7,870	15,496	17,878	14,496	14,020	35,359
$5,000 to $9,999 .... farms	2,281	4,877	5,686	5,100	5,198	11,150
$1,000	16,259	34,909	40,403	37,069	37,249	79,547
$10,000 to $19,999 .... farms	1,938	4,316	4,842	4,715	5,845	9,752
$1,000	27,249	61,816	68,895	68,106	83,766	137,218
$20,000 to $24,999 .... farms	679	1,594	1,483	1,948	1,999	2,890
$1,000	14,979	35,448	33,033	43,388	44,260	63,772
$25,000 to $39,999 .... farms	1,166	3,484	3,120	4,670	4,195	4,626
$1,000	36,612	110,770	99,362	149,361	132,914	144,188
$40,000 to $49,999 .... farms	500	1,897	1,411	2,844	1,902	1,670
$1,000	22,142	84,608	62,858	127,565	84,762	73,819
$50,000 to $99,999 .... farms	1,505	6,245	4,273	9,805	5,609	3,663
$1,000	106,929	456,299	307,348	723,244	400,420	256,024
$100,000 to $249,999 .... farms	1,630	9,029	5,283	14,181	6,423	2,892
$1,000	266,828	1,504,558	875,041	2,396,707	1,043,707	458,770
$250,000 to $499,999 .... farms	1,031	7,101	3,372	9,399	3,751	1,417
$1,000	366,846	2,569,946	1,206,047	3,372,226	1,343,309	498,767
$500,000 or more .... farms	1,655	7,160	4,027	9,478	4,015	1,613
$1,000	4,817,628	8,445,720	5,549,365	13,479,563	11,220,326	3,056,810
2002 value of sales:						
Less than $1,000 (see text) .... farms	8,351	16,559	15,523	19,668	16,466	18,452
$1,000	552	1,328	1,516	915	1,300	2,819
$1,000 to $2,499 .... farms	3,236	4,242	6,097	3,768	3,978	14,466
$1,000	5,345	7,088	10,072	6,246	6,623	24,263
$2,500 to $4,999 .... farms	2,123	4,316	5,169	3,737	4,594	11,778
$1,000	7,453	15,621	18,587	13,593	16,686	42,440
$5,000 to $9,999 .... farms	1,998	5,146	5,760	4,902	6,102	13,561
$1,000	14,353	36,776	41,002	35,352	43,855	95,820
$10,000 to $19,999 .... farms	1,897	5,866	5,555	6,631	6,936	10,659
$1,000	26,483	84,771	79,007	96,195	99,523	148,506
$20,000 to $24,999 .... farms	547	2,114	1,774	2,778	2,320	2,495
$1,000	12,058	46,948	39,366	61,731	51,604	55,155
$25,000 to $39,999 .... farms	1,137	4,767	3,438	6,437	4,621	4,832
$1,000	35,629	151,807	108,843	205,720	146,204	150,233
$40,000 to $49,999 .... farms	467	2,491	1,674	3,601	2,096	1,693
$1,000	20,586	110,695	74,501	160,367	93,441	75,155
$50,000 to $99,999 .... farms	1,368	8,052	4,945	11,718	6,282	3,486
$1,000	97,522	581,380	353,319	846,783	448,705	242,915
$100,000 to $249,999 .... farms	1,679	10,911	5,646	14,920	6,521	2,915
$1,000	269,113	1,773,481	907,375	2,417,878	1,033,957	444,138
$250,000 to $499,999 .... farms	910	5,718	2,859	7,731	2,684	1,250
$1,000	319,331	1,978,684	1,001,820	2,679,591	923,282	433,969
$500,000 or more .... farms	1,304	2,845	1,856	4,764	1,814	954
$1,000	3,099,838	2,887,662	2,147,748	5,749,264	5,881,064	1,364,666
Value of sales by commodity or commodity group:						
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse ....farms, 2007	10,688	49,658	36,142	59,196	36,158	35,077
2002	9,261	50,786	35,457	60,303	36,152	46,370
$1,000, 2007	2,324,789	10,876,415	5,319,019	10,343,585	4,887,212	1,404,769
2002	1,787,172	5,871,542	2,992,747	6,071,272	2,418,447	1,110,209
Grains, oilseeds, dry beans, and dry peas ....farms, 2007	4,649	42,901	29,038	53,417	28,543	8,729
2002	4,500	45,989	28,463	55,294	30,326	8,326
$1,000, 2007	806,299	10,257,765	5,021,216	10,123,033	4,510,045	867,298
2002	479,728	5,335,107	2,646,983	5,858,528	2,102,432	518,327
Corn ....farms, 2007	1,361	38,668	24,597	49,970	11,839	7,107
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	132,097	7,073,343	3,114,306	6,796,492	1,697,262	553,127
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Wheat ....farms, 2007	2,839	9,395	5,033	570	22,430	1,406
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	458,767	229,850	99,664	5,859	1,403,043	58,632
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Soybeans ....farms, 2007	-	34,682	22,569	42,597	13,987	4,447
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	-	2,914,745	1,772,861	3,306,656	688,080	249,237
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Sorghum ....farms, 2007	-	736	88	50	11,419	107
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	-	21,872	3,302	697	673,559	3,825
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Barley ....farms, 2007	2,121	40	32	72	152	47
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	151,675	(D)	48	398	1,675	239
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Rice ....farms, 2007	-	3	-	-	-	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	-	(D)	-	-	-	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Other grains, oilseeds, dry beans, and dry peas ....farms, 2007	1,156	1,043	704	2,558	1,616	113
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	63,760	16,849	31,036	12,930	46,426	2,239
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)

See footnote(s) at end of table. --continued

Table 2. **Market Value of Agricultural Products Sold Including Direct Sales: 2007 and 2002** - Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota
Total sales (see text) ....farms, 2007	30,106	8,136	12,834	7,691	56,014	80,992
2002	27,413	7,196	12,198	6,075	53,315	80,839
$1,000, 2007	2,617,981	617,190	1,835,090	489,820	5,753,219	13,180,466
2002	1,815,803	463,603	1,293,303	384,314	3,772,435	8,575,627
Average per farm ....dollars, 2007	86,959	75,859	142,987	63,687	102,710	162,738
2002	66,239	64,425	106,026	63,262	70,757	106,083
2007 value of sales:						
Less than $1,000 (see text) ....farms	11,583	2,866	3,745	2,380	18,648	26,286
$1,000	1,135	493	451	438	2,372	2,275
$1,000 to $2,499 ....farms	3,043	1,058	1,240	949	5,502	4,392
$1,000	5,018	1,752	2,062	1,546	9,234	7,350
$2,500 to $4,999 ....farms	2,934	838	1,248	839	5,229	4,451
$1,000	10,400	2,991	4,522	3,022	18,659	16,031
$5,000 to $9,999 ....farms	3,295	846	1,272	769	5,292	4,795
$1,000	23,228	5,944	8,991	5,329	37,544	34,430
$10,000 to $19,999 ....farms	2,448	747	1,112	791	4,715	4,926
$1,000	34,099	10,538	15,590	10,979	66,930	70,768
$20,000 to $24,999 ....farms	719	202	357	244	1,379	1,751
$1,000	15,792	4,410	7,865	5,299	30,734	38,828
$25,000 to $39,999 ....farms	1,288	328	629	362	2,791	3,819
$1,000	40,064	10,213	19,730	11,523	88,022	122,318
$40,000 to $49,999 ....farms	483	151	281	156	1,150	1,918
$1,000	21,304	6,737	12,462	6,865	51,181	85,686
$50,000 to $99,999 ....farms	1,091	328	691	398	3,342	6,490
$1,000	75,816	22,723	49,466	27,591	235,867	470,986
$100,000 to $249,999 ....farms	1,030	377	734	397	3,492	9,479
$1,000	174,107	59,785	118,385	60,648	549,825	1,566,188
$250,000 to $499,999 ....farms	787	197	555	212	2,054	6,259
$1,000	294,521	67,611	201,269	73,831	732,045	2,228,906
$500,000 or more ....farms	1,405	198	970	194	2,420	6,426
$1,000	1,922,496	423,992	1,394,298	282,750	3,930,806	8,536,699
2002 value of sales:						
Less than $1,000 (see text) ....farms	7,948	2,659	3,633	1,727	17,442	23,766
$1,000	971	422	428	289	1,558	1,649
$1,000 to $2,499 ....farms	3,890	975	1,483	865	5,849	5,258
$1,000	6,376	1,589	2,412	1,376	9,665	8,662
$2,500 to $4,999 ....farms	3,203	777	1,199	647	4,749	4,417
$1,000	11,391	2,736	4,286	2,243	17,092	16,010
$5,000 to $9,999 ....farms	3,194	682	1,067	623	5,107	5,491
$1,000	22,192	4,783	7,500	4,281	36,516	39,423
$10,000 to $19,999 ....farms	2,435	578	1,006	555	4,930	5,994
$1,000	33,615	8,051	14,179	7,728	70,100	85,952
$20,000 to $24,999 ....farms	604	149	313	160	1,499	2,105
$1,000	13,336	3,292	6,914	3,491	33,184	46,663
$25,000 to $39,999 ....farms	970	269	531	279	2,839	4,813
$1,000	30,362	8,353	16,467	8,821	89,520	153,426
$40,000 to $49,999 ....farms	449	118	197	143	1,180	2,429
$1,000	19,826	5,231	8,685	6,277	52,353	108,292
$50,000 to $99,999 ....farms	1,295	310	670	385	3,229	8,024
$1,000	90,766	22,145	48,317	26,885	228,371	579,548
$100,000 to $249,999 ....farms	1,529	350	814	380	3,231	9,895
$1,000	245,071	56,012	134,476	58,644	513,700	1,597,222
$250,000 to $499,999 ....farms	944	163	630	176	1,807	5,022
$1,000	331,184	55,647	223,996	58,991	625,875	1,734,453
$500,000 or more ....farms	952	166	655	135	1,453	3,625
$1,000	1,010,714	295,343	825,642	205,289	2,094,500	4,204,328
Value of sales by commodity or commodity group:						
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse ....farms, 2007	8,241	4,427	6,763	4,162	32,167	46,189
2002	8,370	3,825	6,252	3,629	29,697	45,614
$1,000, 2007	1,604,647	326,573	629,303	364,481	3,329,928	7,048,913
2002	1,065,611	222,356	450,202	277,069	2,362,628	4,562,882
Grains, oilseeds, dry beans, and dry peas ....farms, 2007	3,097	254	3,501	126	17,140	36,298
2002	3,655	308	3,510	110	16,819	36,628
$1,000, 2007	850,540	9,146	307,944	1,781	1,710,733	5,936,153
2002	368,691	7,794	167,555	1,358	990,921	3,551,017
Corn ....farms, 2007	1,386	62	2,758	117	13,472	30,207
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	337,958	2,574	170,038	1,737	915,597	3,316,564
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Wheat ....farms, 2007	809	8	1,486	5	6,235	6,699
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	42,975	148	46,832	(D)	159,397	451,147
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Soybeans ....farms, 2007	1,518	12	2,165	3	10,749	27,407
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	181,781	(D)	84,062	(D)	540,606	2,017,731
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Sorghum ....farms, 2007	621	-	80	-	68	5
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	61,212	-	734	-	157	6
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Barley ....farms, 2007	-	66	638	-	320	1,038
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	-	(D)	5,430	-	1,778	18,393
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Rice ....farms, 2007	848	-	-	-	-	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	226,279	-	-	-	-	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Other grains, oilseeds, dry beans, and dry peas ....farms, 2007	52	161	225	6	3,136	5,635
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	335	3,811	848	(D)	93,198	132,312
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)

See footnote(s) at end of table. --continued

Table 2. **Market Value of Agricultural Products Sold Including Direct Sales: 2007 and 2002** - Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire
Total sales (see text) ....farms, 2007	41,959	107,825	29,524	47,712	3,131	4,166
2002	42,186	106,797	27,870	49,355	2,989	3,363
$1,000, 2007	4,876,781	7,512,926	2,803,062	15,506,035	513,269	199,051
2002	3,116,295	4,983,255	1,882,114	9,703,657	446,989	144,835
Average per farm ....dollars, 2007	116,227	69,677	94,942	324,992	163,931	47,780
2002	73,870	46,661	67,532	196,609	149,545	43,067
2007 value of sales:						
Less than $1,000 (see text) .... farms	18,389	30,541	9,986	9,086	878	1,434
$1,000	1,447	3,392	715	754	106	246
$1,000 to $2,499 .... farms	3,816	8,938	1,991	1,956	306	634
$1,000	6,307	15,075	3,327	3,233	507	1,048
$2,500 to $4,999 .... farms	3,659	10,172	1,784	1,792	269	466
$1,000	13,107	36,799	6,393	6,494	941	1,686
$5,000 to $9,999 .... farms	4,029	12,872	1,934	2,186	333	469
$1,000	28,572	92,203	13,790	15,794	2,329	3,258
$10,000 to $19,999 .... farms	3,630	12,377	2,070	2,819	262	362
$1,000	50,987	175,934	29,483	40,942	3,788	5,030
$20,000 to $24,999 .... farms	890	3,884	700	1,059	72	104
$1,000	19,597	85,945	15,502	23,477	1,585	2,246
$25,000 to $39,999 .... farms	1,361	7,346	1,458	2,568	154	195
$1,000	42,187	230,505	45,919	82,100	4,779	6,153
$40,000 to $49,999 .... farms	569	3,217	757	1,409	63	68
$1,000	25,155	142,415	33,612	62,519	2,767	2,992
$50,000 to $99,999 .... farms	1,070	6,634	2,464	5,261	179	148
$1,000	74,371	473,382	176,539	384,139	12,856	10,230
$100,000 to $249,999 .... farms	1,049	5,688	3,440	7,947	255	136
$1,000	171,387	931,139	563,632	1,314,877	41,570	20,713
$250,000 to $499,999 .... farms	852	2,959	1,807	5,708	157	85
$1,000	315,923	1,072,242	633,257	2,052,520	53,671	29,596
$500,000 or more .... farms	2,645	3,197	1,133	5,921	203	65
$1,000	4,127,741	4,253,896	1,280,893	11,519,186	388,370	115,854
2002 value of sales:						
Less than $1,000 (see text) .... farms	16,445	23,617	7,968	8,002	758	1,250
$1,000	1,331	2,719	499	502	79	187
$1,000 to $2,499 .... farms	6,001	12,492	2,149	1,818	350	507
$1,000	9,964	20,924	3,565	3,028	569	822
$2,500 to $4,999 .... farms	4,572	11,663	1,776	2,172	256	382
$1,000	16,267	42,110	6,327	7,889	921	1,327
$5,000 to $9,999 .... farms	4,260	15,249	2,162	3,077	291	344
$1,000	29,853	108,657	15,484	22,370	1,998	2,394
$10,000 to $19,999 .... farms	3,130	14,053	2,271	4,220	238	247
$1,000	43,316	197,248	32,405	60,740	3,350	3,434
$20,000 to $24,999 .... farms	762	4,034	772	1,633	74	56
$1,000	16,716	89,156	17,111	36,352	1,623	1,223
$25,000 to $39,999 .... farms	1,155	6,682	1,780	4,083	149	136
$1,000	36,173	209,274	56,409	129,416	4,676	4,090
$40,000 to $49,999 .... farms	433	2,660	938	1,947	65	58
$1,000	19,158	117,894	41,508	86,639	2,799	2,540
$50,000 to $99,999 .... farms	1,071	6,931	3,027	6,619	227	130
$1,000	75,649	487,292	215,811	477,834	16,309	9,255
$100,000 to $249,999 .... farms	1,206	5,271	3,399	8,834	276	130
$1,000	197,863	844,286	526,723	1,411,344	43,170	20,320
$250,000 to $499,999 .... farms	1,269	2,513	1,108	4,126	145	75
$1,000	465,843	869,753	373,328	1,421,255	50,710	25,996
$500,000 or more .... farms	1,882	1,632	520	2,824	160	48
$1,000	2,204,162	1,993,941	592,944	6,046,287	320,784	73,246
Value of sales by commodity or commodity group:						
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse ....farms, 2007	10,712	44,864	12,102	31,099	1,051	2,259
2002	9,724	42,853	11,439	31,493	968	1,730
$1,000, 2007	1,668,028	3,494,938	1,273,721	6,843,325	219,341	106,467
2002	1,025,385	1,992,446	733,324	3,388,265	157,730	83,149
Grains, oilseeds, dry beans, and dry peas ....farms, 2007	3,918	22,731	6,386	26,753	76	60
2002	3,884	24,793	6,517	28,070	97	47
$1,000, 2007	1,089,873	2,963,208	1,009,039	6,528,508	8,455	838
2002	457,364	1,546,535	507,090	3,091,884	(D)	1,246
Corn ....farms, 2007	2,113	15,663	461	23,236	31	55
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	430,983	1,365,543	28,168	4,427,937	2,392	837
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Wheat ....farms, 2007	1,003	7,612	5,428	8,012	38	1
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	85,569	171,548	816,021	407,325	5,678	(D)
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Soybeans ....farms, 2007	2,695	19,048	8	17,192	-	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	405,236	1,272,702	(D)	1,487,283	-	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Sorghum ....farms, 2007	305	1,098	2	1,994	1	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	32,893	33,141	(D)	74,590	(D)	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Barley ....farms, 2007	-	54	2,307	35	6	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	-	163	102,202	194	283	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Rice ....farms, 2007	341	435	-	-	-	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	134,617	115,434	-	-	-	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Other grains, oilseeds, dry beans, and dry peas ....farms, 2007	72	443	1,240	2,274	3	4
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	574	4,675	62,527	131,180	(D)	(D)
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)

See footnote(s) at end of table.

--continued

Table 2. **Market Value of Agricultural Products Sold Including Direct Sales: 2007 and 2002** - Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item		New Jersey	New Mexico	New York	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio
Total sales (see text)	farms, 2007	10,327	20,930	36,352	52,913	31,970	75,861
	2002	9,924	15,170	37,255	53,930	30,619	77,797
	$1,000, 2007	986,885	2,175,080	4,418,634	10,313,628	6,084,218	7,070,212
	2002	749,872	1,700,030	3,117,834	6,961,686	3,233,366	4,263,549
Average per farm	dollars, 2007	95,564	103,922	121,551	194,917	190,310	93,200
	2002	75,561	112,065	83,689	129,087	105,600	54,804
2007 value of sales:							
Less than $1,000 (see text)	farms	3,194	7,613	9,847	15,855	10,650	20,019
	$1,000	1,071	976	1,394	2,484	397	2,940
$1,000 to $2,499	farms	1,754	2,883	3,157	6,753	736	7,537
	$1,000	2,766	4,669	5,178	11,000	1,241	12,511
$2,500 to $4,999	farms	999	2,520	3,075	5,863	868	7,357
	$1,000	3,522	8,934	11,042	20,983	3,131	26,333
$5,000 to $9,999	farms	1,007	2,252	3,770	5,805	1,215	7,793
	$1,000	7,011	15,518	26,785	41,134	8,884	55,802
$10,000 to $19,999	farms	806	1,650	3,674	4,704	1,428	6,827
	$1,000	11,271	22,945	51,093	64,868	20,723	97,442
$20,000 to $24,999	farms	302	414	1,032	1,124	539	2,218
	$1,000	6,573	9,124	22,778	24,723	12,005	49,279
$25,000 to $39,999	farms	468	753	1,883	1,956	1,361	4,478
	$1,000	14,747	23,397	59,246	61,285	43,335	142,141
$40,000 to $49,999	farms	188	312	811	809	802	2,023
	$1,000	8,280	13,830	35,982	35,730	35,518	90,602
$50,000 to $99,999	farms	462	844	2,253	1,718	2,891	5,565
	$1,000	31,849	60,242	161,929	121,445	211,633	402,232
$100,000 to $249,999	farms	461	759	3,295	1,854	4,303	5,720
	$1,000	72,630	120,633	544,576	309,261	721,316	927,974
$250,000 to $499,999	farms	286	376	1,805	1,866	3,552	3,237
	$1,000	99,373	132,249	630,352	688,110	1,269,432	1,153,405
$500,000 or more	farms	400	554	1,750	4,606	3,625	3,087
	$1,000	727,792	1,762,563	2,868,278	8,932,607	3,756,602	4,109,551
2002 value of sales:							
Less than $1,000 (see text)	farms	2,927	5,519	9,825	13,520	8,634	18,939
	$1,000	937	429	1,101	1,841	250	2,474
$1,000 to $2,499	farms	2,306	1,993	4,418	8,576	677	9,979
	$1,000	3,596	3,251	7,245	14,088	1,151	16,517
$2,500 to $4,999	farms	991	1,408	3,364	6,350	1,004	9,022
	$1,000	3,432	4,981	12,045	22,575	3,690	32,110
$5,000 to $9,999	farms	820	1,443	3,223	5,925	1,471	8,718
	$1,000	5,604	10,168	22,764	41,283	10,702	61,886
$10,000 to $19,999	farms	692	1,208	3,278	4,585	2,165	8,161
	$1,000	9,562	16,848	45,447	63,873	31,196	115,285
$20,000 to $24,999	farms	259	378	898	1,273	915	2,482
	$1,000	5,664	8,258	19,765	28,108	20,292	55,021
$25,000 to $39,999	farms	347	623	1,880	1,848	1,965	4,431
	$1,000	10,858	19,442	59,326	57,476	62,353	139,281
$40,000 to $49,999	farms	142	270	845	854	1,108	1,900
	$1,000	6,185	11,878	37,496	37,749	49,187	84,619
$50,000 to $99,999	farms	381	740	3,073	2,208	3,851	5,297
	$1,000	26,794	51,971	225,097	158,105	277,864	373,061
$100,000 to $249,999	farms	463	773	3,878	2,630	5,221	5,384
	$1,000	72,918	123,777	616,540	439,924	831,944	845,567
$250,000 to $499,999	farms	256	349	1,491	2,579	2,381	2,288
	$1,000	88,966	123,763	504,859	931,601	816,893	780,893
$500,000 or more	farms	340	466	1,082	3,582	1,227	1,196
	$1,000	515,357	1,325,264	1,566,149	5,165,062	1,127,844	1,756,836
Value of sales by commodity or commodity group:							
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse	farms, 2007	6,505	7,441	20,009	23,575	18,127	45,060
	2002	6,199	4,739	18,743	24,587	16,938	45,454
	$1,000, 2007	851,653	553,140	1,561,927	2,606,279	5,038,521	4,109,722
	2002	657,494	397,257	1,135,129	2,008,634	2,460,372	2,304,895
Grains, oilseeds, dry beans, and dry peas	farms, 2007	1,120	1,054	5,249	9,803	15,377	30,658
	2002	1,083	742	4,786	9,513	15,015	30,873
	$1,000, 2007	59,860	132,548	315,647	697,792	4,567,800	3,361,418
	2002	29,885	68,256	156,300	359,296	2,083,788	1,541,122
Corn	farms, 2007	797	398	4,332	6,476	6,401	24,006
	2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
	$1,000, 2007	32,981	70,667	210,169	347,995	821,072	1,643,456
	2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Wheat	farms, 2007	317	525	1,039	3,179	12,282	11,426
	2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
	$1,000, 2007	6,656	43,005	28,470	96,691	1,845,619	204,871
	2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Soybeans	farms, 2007	533	4	1,239	7,080	5,994	24,360
	2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
	$1,000, 2007	19,279	108	61,789	246,716	780,507	1,495,598
	2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Sorghum	farms, 2007	16	260	45	233	12	50
	2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
	$1,000, 2007	118	12,546	122	1,495	44	909
	2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Barley	farms, 2007	46	9	301	222	4,839	190
	2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
	$1,000, 2007	416	303	1,118	2,273	254,809	482
	2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Rice	farms, 2007	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
	$1,000, 2007	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Other grains, oilseeds, dry beans, and dry peas	farms, 2007	116	179	1,583	791	8,719	2,397
	2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
	$1,000, 2007	410	5,920	13,979	2,621	865,748	16,103
	2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)

See footnote(s) at end of table. --continued

Table 2. **Market Value of Agricultural Products Sold Including Direct Sales: 2007 and 2002** - Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	Rhode Island	South Carolina
Total sales (see text) ......farms, 2007	86,565	38,553	63,163	1,219	25,867
2002	83,300	40,033	58,105	858	24,541
$1,000, 2007	5,806,061	4,386,143	5,808,803	65,908	2,352,681
2002	4,456,404	3,195,497	4,256,959	55,546	1,489,750
Average per farm ......dollars, 2007	67,072	113,769	91,965	54,067	90,953
2002	53,498	79,822	73,263	64,740	60,705
2007 value of sales:					
Less than $1,000 (see text) ......farms	26,638	11,763	21,425	361	11,291
$1,000	3,400	2,196	3,032	54	1,177
$1,000 to $2,499 ......farms	8,031	5,687	6,070	126	3,045
$1,000	13,365	9,327	10,163	202	5,041
$2,500 to $4,999 ......farms	9,059	4,651	5,609	140	2,609
$1,000	32,379	16,493	20,095	511	9,290
$5,000 to $9,999 ......farms	10,731	3,934	5,746	147	2,875
$1,000	75,936	27,592	41,029	1,054	20,269
$10,000 to $19,999 ......farms	10,529	2,807	4,943	133	1,800
$1,000	147,880	38,969	70,203	1,874	25,452
$20,000 to $24,999 ......farms	2,965	923	1,545	46	489
$1,000	65,247	20,252	34,269	1,004	10,809
$25,000 to $39,999 ......farms	4,932	1,592	2,884	68	964
$1,000	153,476	49,613	90,821	2,092	30,345
$40,000 to $49,999 ......farms	1,954	680	1,219	25	325
$1,000	86,245	29,850	54,101	1,101	14,318
$50,000 to $99,999 ......farms	4,563	1,838	3,067	56	664
$1,000	320,139	129,394	222,378	3,896	46,571
$100,000 to $249,999 ......farms	3,651	1,939	5,695	57	515
$1,000	588,738	307,708	972,348	8,642	82,697
$250,000 to $499,999 ......farms	1,675	1,077	2,718	31	329
$1,000	603,357	380,667	955,587	10,369	119,053
$500,000 or more ......farms	1,837	1,662	2,242	29	961
$1,000	3,715,900	3,374,081	3,334,777	35,109	1,987,659
2002 value of sales:					
Less than $1,000 (see text) ......farms	20,060	11,060	17,658	207	10,752
$1,000	2,257	1,891	1,891	28	1,066
$1,000 to $2,499 ......farms	9,867	7,813	6,736	80	3,744
$1,000	16,412	12,606	11,172	132	6,148
$2,500 to $4,999 ......farms	9,925	4,737	5,881	110	2,543
$1,000	35,590	16,704	21,088	388	9,104
$5,000 to $9,999 ......farms	12,452	4,043	5,134	98	2,204
$1,000	87,909	28,351	36,297	659	15,466
$10,000 to $19,999 ......farms	10,056	3,107	4,643	94	1,683
$1,000	139,858	43,427	65,183	1,310	23,216
$20,000 to $24,999 ......farms	2,777	804	1,341	36	434
$1,000	61,345	17,698	29,660	795	9,515
$25,000 to $39,999 ......farms	5,437	1,591	2,217	45	676
$1,000	169,164	49,857	69,945	1,404	20,988
$40,000 to $49,999 ......farms	1,936	815	1,075	20	245
$1,000	85,330	35,978	47,701	864	10,854
$50,000 to $99,999 ......farms	4,340	1,876	3,823	56	600
$1,000	302,570	131,951	282,356	4,042	41,875
$100,000 to $249,999 ......farms	3,647	1,935	6,195	65	571
$1,000	568,762	313,626	956,471	10,375	92,109
$250,000 to $499,999 ......farms	1,609	1,113	1,977	19	399
$1,000	561,561	389,960	678,145	6,753	142,294
$500,000 or more ......farms	1,194	1,139	1,425	28	690
$1,000	2,425,646	2,153,448	2,057,051	28,797	1,117,115
Value of sales by commodity or commodity group:					
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse ......farms, 2007	26,515	16,488	33,119	705	8,781
2002	22,786	16,853	28,094	526	7,869
$1,000, 2007	1,187,625	2,976,087	1,869,706	55,602	798,490
2002	819,078	2,194,911	1,320,914	47,138	593,245
Grains, oilseeds, dry beans, and dry peas ......farms, 2007	9,450	1,845	15,771	20	3,365
2002	10,524	2,217	13,621	23	2,755
$1,000, 2007	698,093	316,772	500,428	94	214,661
2002	432,194	149,648	203,156	171	81,580
Corn ......farms, 2007	1,034	379	13,436	17	2,591
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	149,778	37,084	319,930	93	129,332
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Wheat ......farms, 2007	8,555	1,400	4,463	-	711
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	464,517	255,159	45,332	-	17,941
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Soybeans ......farms, 2007	951	2	5,713	-	1,974
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	36,486	(D)	122,103	-	64,675
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Sorghum ......farms, 2007	981	4	158	-	87
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	38,706	(D)	506	-	1,003
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Barley ......farms, 2007	42	331	1,787	-	25
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	(D)	12,468	5,325	-	115
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Rice ......farms, 2007	3	-	-	-	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	(D)	-	-	-	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Other grains, oilseeds, dry beans, and dry peas ......farms, 2007	535	382	4,175	3	460
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	7,543	12,017	7,232	1	1,595
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)

See footnote(s) at end of table. --continued

Table 2. **Market Value of Agricultural Products Sold Including Direct Sales: 2007 and 2002** - Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Vermont
Total sales (see text) .... farms, 2007	31,169	79,280	247,437	16,700	6,984
2002	31,736	87,595	228,926	15,282	6,571
$1,000, 2007	6,570,450	2,617,394	21,001,074	1,415,678	673,713
2002	3,834,625	2,199,814	14,134,744	1,115,898	473,065
Average per farm .... dollars, 2007	210,801	33,015	84,874	84,771	96,465
2002	120,829	25,113	61,744	73,020	71,993
2007 value of sales:					
Less than $1,000 (see text) .... farms	6,981	27,068	86,279	4,806	1,778
$1,000	465	4,089	11,329	685	341
$1,000 to $2,499 .... farms	1,296	11,454	30,608	2,253	803
$1,000	2,174	19,346	50,794	3,710	1,297
$2,500 to $4,999 .... farms	1,077	9,539	28,630	1,857	695
$1,000	3,860	34,108	102,467	6,595	2,511
$5,000 to $9,999 .... farms	1,433	11,217	30,256	1,951	841
$1,000	10,349	79,899	213,977	13,855	5,930
$10,000 to $19,999 .... farms	1,809	7,476	23,546	1,528	710
$1,000	26,034	104,602	328,934	21,289	9,633
$20,000 to $24,999 .... farms	706	2,012	6,554	466	192
$1,000	15,727	44,182	144,638	10,255	4,207
$25,000 to $39,999 .... farms	1,576	3,393	10,804	948	365
$1,000	50,300	105,537	338,673	29,897	11,501
$40,000 to $49,999 .... farms	939	1,319	4,406	415	132
$1,000	41,910	58,180	194,666	18,463	5,850
$50,000 to $99,999 .... farms	3,409	2,001	8,774	860	390
$1,000	247,296	139,821	612,408	60,967	28,264
$100,000 to $249,999 .... farms	5,511	1,630	7,238	785	473
$1,000	919,156	262,088	1,154,800	125,943	77,936
$250,000 to $499,999 .... farms	3,588	956	4,296	400	314
$1,000	1,267,732	342,793	1,544,859	141,815	108,787
$500,000 or more .... farms	2,844	1,215	6,046	431	291
$1,000	3,985,447	1,422,750	16,303,529	982,202	417,456
2002 value of sales:					
Less than $1,000 (see text) .... farms	5,765	24,910	64,572	5,628	1,705
$1,000	327	3,698	9,765	597	281
$1,000 to $2,499 .... farms	1,187	17,831	37,501	1,664	968
$1,000	1,977	29,551	62,090	2,698	1,545
$2,500 to $4,999 .... farms	1,412	12,859	32,353	1,455	699
$1,000	5,047	45,398	115,234	5,185	2,508
$5,000 to $9,999 .... farms	1,774	12,311	29,248	1,399	610
$1,000	12,886	86,097	205,491	9,822	4,224
$10,000 to $19,999 .... farms	2,528	8,129	23,027	1,350	517
$1,000	36,479	112,444	319,231	19,116	7,265
$20,000 to $24,999 .... farms	1,002	1,883	5,565	383	116
$1,000	22,154	41,581	122,625	8,512	2,544
$25,000 to $39,999 .... farms	2,472	2,822	9,582	720	262
$1,000	78,246	87,591	299,157	22,509	8,254
$40,000 to $49,999 .... farms	1,366	869	3,645	308	134
$1,000	60,739	38,353	161,380	13,581	5,864
$50,000 to $99,999 .... farms	4,564	2,133	8,769	788	393
$1,000	327,010	148,735	610,754	56,270	29,418
$100,000 to $249,999 .... farms	6,117	1,915	7,465	788	716
$1,000	967,274	309,966	1,185,554	126,338	116,150
$250,000 to $499,999 .... farms	2,324	1,131	3,836	419	269
$1,000	794,925	396,453	1,336,948	146,615	92,123
$500,000 or more .... farms	1,225	802	3,363	380	182
$1,000	1,527,562	899,948	9,706,516	704,654	202,890
Value of sales by commodity or commodity group:					
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse .... farms, 2007	18,146	23,108	67,997	6,974	4,027
2002	17,585	29,143	56,090	5,088	3,521
$1,000, 2007	3,383,497	1,147,786	6,565,576	372,396	99,262
2002	1,575,910	1,072,548	3,731,751	257,797	71,583
Grains, oilseeds, dry beans, and dry peas .... farms, 2007	15,123	5,533	14,713	1,496	232
2002	14,792	5,361	16,490	1,158	138
$1,000, 2007	3,238,162	496,727	2,472,814	58,897	5,439
2002	1,406,137	344,880	1,099,460	30,139	2,768
Corn .... farms, 2007	12,076	4,494	5,124	640	218
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	1,412,488	279,356	1,089,321	21,199	4,890
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Wheat .... farms, 2007	7,144	1,340	8,372	599	6
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	713,110	46,088	689,274	30,173	124
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Soybeans .... farms, 2007	10,122	3,133	494	-	13
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	949,942	164,911	29,210	-	401
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Sorghum .... farms, 2007	421	78	6,154	7	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	19,786	3,083	540,821	89	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Barley .... farms, 2007	190	16	26	456	1
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	3,795	148	425	4,433	(D)
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Rice .... farms, 2007	-	6	385	-	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	-	2,293	98,385	-	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Other grains, oilseeds, dry beans, and dry peas .... farms, 2007	2,564	62	1,393	353	7
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	139,042	848	25,379	3,003	(D)
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)

See footnote(s) at end of table. --continued

Table 2. **Market Value of Agricultural Products Sold Including Direct Sales: 2007 and 2002** - Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Virginia	Washington	West Virginia	Wisconsin	Wyoming
Total sales (see text) ....farms, 2007	47,383	39,284	23,618	78,463	11,069
2002	47,606	35,939	20,812	77,131	9,422
$1,000, 2007	2,906,188	6,792,856	591,665	8,967,358	1,157,535
2002	2,360,911	5,330,740	482,814	5,623,275	863,887
Average per farm ....dollars, 2007	61,334	172,917	25,051	114,288	104,575
2002	49,593	148,327	23,199	72,906	91,688
2007 value of sales:					
Less than $1,000 (see text) ....farms	14,738	13,826	7,589	24,588	3,222
$1,000	2,248	1,852	1,777	3,130	298
$1,000 to $2,499 ....farms	5,453	4,617	4,844	5,708	698
$1,000	9,177	7,694	7,720	9,485	1,138
$2,500 to $4,999 ....farms	5,391	3,817	3,531	5,955	918
$1,000	19,645	13,456	12,477	21,676	3,249
$5,000 to $9,999 ....farms	6,191	3,717	2,913	6,732	947
$1,000	44,218	26,073	20,363	48,316	6,739
$10,000 to $19,999 ....farms	5,141	2,582	2,050	5,865	883
$1,000	72,012	36,135	28,205	83,710	12,428
$20,000 to $24,999 ....farms	1,456	841	488	1,867	378
$1,000	32,187	18,438	10,783	41,568	8,363
$25,000 to $39,999 ....farms	2,428	1,507	724	3,866	617
$1,000	75,928	47,606	22,468	123,068	19,602
$40,000 to $49,999 ....farms	971	683	309	1,838	305
$1,000	42,772	30,190	13,760	81,988	13,600
$50,000 to $99,999 ....farms	1,886	1,729	421	5,397	975
$1,000	132,093	121,344	28,982	389,003	70,601
$100,000 to $249,999 ....farms	1,421	1,950	314	8,550	1,176
$1,000	230,589	321,930	50,839	1,406,417	187,899
$250,000 to $499,999 ....farms	926	1,579	176	4,639	555
$1,000	339,141	563,523	61,461	1,603,196	196,789
$500,000 or more ....farms	1,381	2,436	259	3,458	395
$1,000	1,906,175	5,604,614	332,829	5,155,802	636,830
2002 value of sales:					
Less than $1,000 (see text) ....farms	11,418	10,420	7,835	24,161	2,067
$1,000	1,605	1,143	1,015	1,767	160
$1,000 to $2,499 ....farms	7,006	4,585	4,219	6,330	828
$1,000	11,788	7,454	6,709	10,461	1,393
$2,500 to $4,999 ....farms	6,669	3,244	2,712	5,389	575
$1,000	23,933	11,473	9,647	19,454	2,057
$5,000 to $9,999 ....farms	6,946	3,106	2,398	5,788	935
$1,000	48,954	21,600	16,732	41,633	6,652
$10,000 to $19,999 ....farms	5,424	2,628	1,533	6,128	900
$1,000	75,413	36,480	21,013	87,632	12,611
$20,000 to $24,999 ....farms	1,313	826	342	2,234	324
$1,000	29,035	18,162	7,543	49,569	7,164
$25,000 to $39,999 ....farms	2,200	1,643	523	3,924	622
$1,000	69,178	51,515	16,072	124,830	19,665
$40,000 to $49,999 ....farms	860	735	172	2,005	366
$1,000	38,088	32,358	7,596	89,555	16,255
$50,000 to $99,999 ....farms	1,849	2,157	383	7,242	998
$1,000	129,275	155,079	26,226	529,536	72,729
$100,000 to $249,999 ....farms	1,708	2,893	297	9,247	1,069
$1,000	277,501	470,504	46,513	1,454,143	168,621
$250,000 to $499,999 ....farms	1,137	1,741	172	2,945	441
$1,000	396,285	606,439	60,455	999,152	148,552
$500,000 or more ....farms	1,076	1,961	226	1,738	297
$1,000	1,259,855	3,918,533	263,294	2,215,542	408,030
Value of sales by commodity or commodity group:					
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse ....farms, 2007	16,493	16,374	9,086	43,189	3,622
2002	17,672	17,117	5,883	36,708	2,701
$1,000, 2007	858,301	4,754,898	78,308	2,669,326	213,808
2002	718,219	3,582,818	69,693	1,690,071	137,776
Grains, oilseeds, dry beans, and dry peas ....farms, 2007	4,119	3,378	697	27,775	1,051
2002	4,164	4,036	496	25,170	896
$1,000, 2007	269,782	958,931	11,960	1,643,341	72,618
2002	157,985	581,991	9,575	893,272	44,522
Corn ....farms, 2007	3,125	849	565	24,112	450
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	115,268	134,673	6,549	1,136,931	25,840
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Wheat ....farms, 2007	1,328	2,591	113	5,377	345
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	51,197	696,309	1,779	96,576	15,817
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Soybeans ....farms, 2007	2,121	11	119	13,821	2
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	97,961	642	3,399	390,672	(D)
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Sorghum ....farms, 2007	53	-	3	11	6
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	245	-	(D)	25	(D)
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Barley ....farms, 2007	472	827	35	479	338
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	3,863	58,084	89	1,272	15,346
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Rice ....farms, 2007	-	-	-	-	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	-	-	-	-	-
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
Other grains, oilseeds, dry beans, and dry peas ....farms, 2007	352	816	113	5,718	344
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
$1,000, 2007	1,247	69,223	(D)	17,865	15,562
2002	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)

See footnote(s) at end of table.

--continued

Table 2. **Market Value of Agricultural Products Sold Including Direct Sales: 2007 and 2002** - Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	United States	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California
Total sales (see text) - Con.						
Value of sales by commodity or commodity group - Con.						
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse - Con.						
Tobacco ....farms, 2007	16,228	-	-	-	-	-
2002	56,879	6	-	-	-	-
$1,000, 2007	1,268,114	-	-	-	-	-
2002	1,616,533	698	-	-	-	-
Cotton and cottonseed ....farms, 2007	18,591	918	-	301	915	854
2002	24,721	1,305	-	409	1,192	1,392
$1,000, 2007	4,898,608	104,632	-	147,761	473,019	586,267
2002	4,005,366	125,232	-	150,682	379,253	682,996
Vegetables, melons, potatoes, and sweet potatoes [1] ....farms, 2007	69,100	1,602	95	2,518	809	3,958
2002	59,044	1,407	86	282	516	4,131
$1,000, 2007	14,683,058	33,902	4,281	865,260	38,145	5,435,521
2002	12,785,898	40,649	4,017	749,667	23,342	4,785,101
Fruits, tree nuts, and berries ....farms, 2007	112,690	1,708	41	1,326	620	38,034
2002	107,707	1,548	22	1,192	599	36,386
$1,000, 2007	18,625,459	27,610	75	97,745	13,209	11,054,581
2002	13,770,603	20,543	(D)	(D)	12,920	8,720,660
Nursery, greenhouse, floriculture, and sod (see text) ....farms, 2007	50,784	675	138	281	357	3,634
2002	56,070	797	111	367	330	4,423
$1,000, 2007	16,632,734	264,807	15,478	417,792	48,049	3,647,057
2002	14,686,390	251,463	12,680	284,463	46,982	3,286,627
Cut Christmas trees and short-rotation woody crops ....farms, 2007	13,374	59	-	10	51	322
2002	14,744	91	2	15	41	403
$1,000, 2007	384,594	1,036	-	19	1,168	5,704
2002	399,848	1,200	(D)	(D)	332	12,028
Other crops and hay (see text) ....farms, 2007	434,502	8,976	201	849	9,555	5,265
2002	359,262	6,234	198	777	5,915	5,730
$1,000, 2007	9,950,098	124,344	4,328	266,943	74,476	1,068,522
2002	7,929,618	87,535	3,057	186,297	34,672	943,216
Livestock, poultry, and their products ....farms, 2007	1,080,312	28,121	303	8,301	29,296	23,192
2002	1,094,608	28,496	262	3,220	30,956	22,342
$1,000, 2007	153,562,563	3,738,563	32,271	1,321,538	4,607,833	10,982,043
2002	105,494,401	2,674,681	25,600	807,672	3,330,014	6,584,451
Poultry and eggs ....farms, 2007	148,911	4,884	88	1,022	5,640	4,114
2002	83,381	3,839	47	303	5,148	1,980
$1,000, 2007	37,065,947	3,113,194	207	(D)	3,716,164	1,536,763
2002	23,972,333	2,137,299	104	(D)	2,617,592	1,017,988
Cattle and calves ....farms, 2007	798,290	21,356	75	4,078	23,731	12,681
2002	851,971	23,088	83	2,030	25,955	12,897
$1,000, 2007	61,209,970	408,276	768	585,479	625,996	2,536,571
2002	45,115,184	348,253	759	403,959	421,266	1,582,334
Milk and other dairy products from cows ....farms, 2007	69,763	165	7	190	369	1,953
2002	78,963	266	18	127	396	2,422
$1,000, 2007	31,848,029	38,270	1,487	634,509	44,770	6,569,172
2002	20,281,166	46,129	3,246	352,784	54,049	3,739,213
Hogs and pigs ....farms, 2007	74,789	547	50	284	954	1,267
2002	82,028	561	47	168	867	1,513
$1,000, 2007	18,056,981	54,618	242	(D)	84,202	34,188
2002	12,400,977	39,441	205	(D)	123,803	27,488
Sheep, goats, and their products ....farms, 2007	121,171	2,410	40	3,437	1,584	4,635
2002	96,249	1,383	36	441	1,033	4,256
$1,000, 2007	704,855	3,128	48	(D)	2,573	71,890
2002	541,745	1,534	29	4,028	1,604	52,418
Horses, ponies, mules, burros, and donkeys ....farms, 2007	114,317	3,039	44	1,452	2,512	3,937
2002	128,045	2,885	29	900	2,707	4,033
$1,000, 2007	2,061,862	13,434	247	12,126	9,877	72,433
2002	1,328,733	13,851	111	(D)	12,865	32,397
Aquaculture (see text) .... farms, 2007	6,409	313	51	15	248	217
2002	6,653	449	47	10	244	204
$1,000, 2007	1,415,271	99,504	28,540	2,713	118,744	102,228
2002	1,132,524	80,976	20,807	755	92,638	64,557
Other animals and other animal products (see text) ....farms, 2007	43,226	586	66	249	668	1,583
2002	29,391	412	59	151	509	1,665
$1,000, 2007	1,199,649	8,140	731	7,206	5,507	58,798
2002	721,738	7,198	339	1,976	6,196	68,057
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ....farms, 2007	136,817	2,175	149	863	1,657	7,068
2002	116,733	1,822	110	711	1,476	6,436
$1,000, 2007	1,211,270	8,325	1,682	5,247	8,161	162,896
2002	812,204	8,039	829	3,911	5,674	114,356

See footnote(s) at end of table.

--continued

Table 2. **Market Value of Agricultural Products Sold Including Direct Sales: 2007 and 2002** - Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Hawaii
Total sales (see text) - Con.						
Value of sales by commodity or commodity group - Con.						
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse - Con.						
Tobacco ...farms, 2007	-	75	-	23	224	-
2002	-	80	-	115	822	-
$1,000, 2007	-	56,976	-	4,715	56,978	-
2002	-	36,233	-	15,919	89,058	-
Cotton and cottonseed ...farms, 2007	-	-	-	213	2,577	-
2002	-	-	-	267	3,206	-
$1,000, 2007	-	-	-	28,469	434,014	-
2002	-	-	-	21,037	318,013	-
Vegetables, melons, potatoes, and sweet potatoes [1] ...farms, 2007	738	733	234	1,493	1,346	866
2002	654	582	248	1,559	1,715	666
$1,000, 2007	289,345	30,230	71,479	1,422,150	459,612	61,256
2002	297,752	19,120	50,773	1,013,022	383,556	54,554
Fruits, tree nuts, and berries ...farms, 2007	767	499	64	8,858	3,397	3,667
2002	582	366	67	9,674	3,611	2,582
$1,000, 2007	23,192	28,641	(D)	2,144,718	201,504	154,315
2002	15,735	14,721	2,496	1,611,562	122,151	179,475
Nursery, greenhouse, floriculture, and sod (see text) ...farms, 2007	564	638	175	4,778	1,030	1,628
2002	535	685	129	4,718	1,199	1,386
$1,000, 2007	299,585	269,221	17,114	2,115,641	317,291	119,593
2002	261,426	245,773	22,420	1,844,064	315,324	110,282
Cut Christmas trees and short-rotation woody crops ...farms, 2007	122	338	41	53	144	44
2002	91	382	58	79	188	19
$1,000, 2007	1,238	3,840	(D)	390	3,380	282
2002	398	3,407	401	1,056	2,095	336
Other crops and hay (see text) ...farms, 2007	9,415	1,493	218	3,312	8,593	274
2002	6,410	1,064	227	2,484	7,691	271
$1,000, 2007	318,285	10,148	2,375	506,801	368,738	75,118
2002	192,590	6,863	1,921	516,974	246,936	86,061
Livestock, poultry, and their products ...farms, 2007	17,525	2,040	1,372	21,333	23,271	1,531
2002	16,866	1,490	1,306	20,824	25,319	1,007
$1,000, 2007	4,079,735	150,181	872,400	1,529,000	4,970,596	83,711
2002	3,308,918	143,110	468,449	1,200,839	3,332,156	88,067
Poultry and eggs ...farms, 2007	2,515	801	978	2,984	5,041	282
2002	861	415	857	1,387	3,883	110
$1,000, 2007	161,320	45,274	837,378	410,148	4,246,765	(D)
2002	113,256	62,411	440,774	336,295	2,780,214	12,545
Cattle and calves ...farms, 2007	11,963	805	307	14,146	16,261	713
2002	11,877	715	276	14,149	18,770	550
$1,000, 2007	3,156,348	9,405	7,567	436,193	342,392	44,011
2002	2,632,740	7,025	3,254	328,820	240,070	30,719
Milk and other dairy products from cows ...farms, 2007	447	261	83	227	651	5
2002	260	218	89	452	517	10
$1,000, 2007	456,076	72,338	21,715	412,211	264,423	7,018
2002	247,095	56,523	20,651	371,691	212,720	21,745
Hogs and pigs ...farms, 2007	1,230	251	84	1,326	830	148
2002	1,158	176	86	1,090	995	158
$1,000, 2007	159,808	616	2,754	2,220	68,369	(D)
2002	179,415	(D)	2,853	3,154	65,384	4,612
Sheep, goats, and their products ...farms, 2007	2,273	434	140	2,001	2,244	266
2002	1,926	269	78	1,249	1,792	145
$1,000, 2007	84,730	1,094	(D)	2,419	4,137	923
2002	72,479	528	45	1,348	1,940	1,081
Horses, ponies, mules, burros, and donkeys ...farms, 2007	3,324	221	92	3,576	2,357	96
2002	3,764	156	150	3,996	2,677	82
$1,000, 2007	29,304	4,868	2,278	167,784	21,326	(D)
2002	21,365	2,671	588	73,858	16,573	418
Aquaculture (see text) ... farms, 2007	55	49	4	469	146	59
2002	66	41	13	777	159	67
$1,000, 2007	11,258	15,142	(D)	61,340	14,075	14,057
2002	28,805	12,848	240	56,949	5,310	14,005
Other animals and other animal products (see text) ...farms, 2007	1,052	271	57	1,206	762	196
2002	896	221	23	1,062	433	65
$1,000, 2007	20,890	1,444	203	36,686	9,109	5,787
2002	13,763	(D)	43	28,724	9,944	2,940
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ...farms, 2007	2,777	1,099	216	3,181	1,890	1,141
2002	2,343	853	149	2,479	1,626	796
$1,000, 2007	22,584	29,752	3,505	19,363	13,146	8,657
2002	17,406	17,108	2,856	12,370	8,958	7,089

See footnote(s) at end of table.

--continued

Table 2. **Market Value of Agricultural Products Sold Including Direct Sales: 2007 and 2002** - Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Idaho	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky
Total sales (see text) - Con.						
Value of sales by commodity or commodity group - Con.						
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse - Con.						
Tobacco .... farms, 2007	-	13	267	-	-	8,112
2002	-	6	1,286	3	12	29,253
$1,000, 2007	-	2,620	6,598	-	-	314,151
2002	-	955	13,290	29	(D)	403,991
Cotton and cottonseed .... farms, 2007	-	-	-	-	110	-
2002	-	-	-	-	162	-
$1,000, 2007	-	-	-	-	13,673	-
2002	-	-	-	-	15,762	-
Vegetables, melons, potatoes, and sweet potatoes [1] .... farms, 2007	1,259	1,382	1,380	885	474	2,098
2002	1,307	1,115	1,175	757	270	1,474
$1,000, 2007	783,807	103,914	78,719	16,310	24,767	20,937
2002	752,994	98,067	77,583	19,491	14,317	17,757
Fruits, tree nuts, and berries .... farms, 2007	420	627	749	735	344	713
2002	340	772	676	412	209	723
$1,000, 2007	30,036	10,246	19,193	7,371	7,293	3,088
2002	17,471	18,559	15,787	4,496	(D)	5,941
Nursery, greenhouse, floriculture, and sod (see text) .... farms, 2007	548	1,159	888	536	399	1,191
2002	458	1,108	1,117	554	369	1,193
$1,000, 2007	87,373	435,073	126,241	93,813	77,031	87,748
2002	66,297	357,506	187,529	77,610	57,561	96,094
Cut Christmas trees and short-rotation woody crops .... farms, 2007	80	248	202	169	67	129
2002	56	338	265	215	102	143
$1,000, 2007	2,096	6,473	2,662	1,026	473	876
2002	862	7,633	2,775	1,424	(D)	1,019
Other crops and hay (see text) .... farms, 2007	7,853	9,216	8,493	12,209	13,231	21,670
2002	6,911	8,005	8,449	12,703	12,466	17,200
$1,000, 2007	615,179	60,325	64,391	102,032	253,930	110,671
2002	469,820	53,716	48,800	109,695	225,361	67,080
Livestock, poultry, and their products .... farms, 2007	12,627	22,851	23,677	38,275	31,417	46,912
2002	12,155	23,957	24,616	40,829	32,818	47,382
$1,000, 2007	3,363,976	2,452,692	2,952,272	10,074,511	9,525,971	3,419,792
2002	2,121,090	1,804,697	1,790,411	6,202,362	6,327,797	1,969,871
Poultry and eggs .... farms, 2007	1,075	2,708	3,798	3,174	2,388	4,088
2002	631	1,063	1,614	1,572	1,102	1,649
$1,000, 2007	12,673	163,507	887,196	872,263	69,807	978,025
2002	12,636	83,807	455,153	511,949	(D)	561,178
Cattle and calves .... farms, 2007	9,662	16,046	15,088	27,535	27,565	38,212
2002	9,035	17,699	16,879	29,515	29,589	40,429
$1,000, 2007	1,383,742	808,487	456,657	3,606,633	8,542,872	935,611
2002	1,149,407	624,976	324,054	2,119,935	5,715,204	622,855
Milk and other dairy products from cows .... farms, 2007	809	1,255	2,071	2,465	795	2,273
2002	790	1,442	2,345	2,913	842	2,208
$1,000, 2007	1,843,788	340,336	583,212	689,680	376,511	250,305
2002	869,526	226,761	333,339	442,431	248,542	214,365
Hogs and pigs .... farms, 2007	728	3,063	3,790	8,758	1,542	1,210
2002	980	4,313	4,603	11,275	1,939	1,220
$1,000, 2007	6,757	1,105,271	974,290	4,827,224	506,448	90,198
2002	3,260	844,360	633,112	3,078,455	297,505	69,722
Sheep, goats, and their products .... farms, 2007	1,516	2,551	3,000	4,386	1,876	3,508
2002	1,398	2,049	2,525	3,842	1,569	2,270
$1,000, 2007	27,373	6,523	7,422	40,199	12,027	7,208
2002	22,212	3,591	4,419	23,366	5,986	4,679
Horses, ponies, mules, burros, and donkeys .... farms, 2007	1,873	1,801	2,749	2,706	1,862	5,391
2002	2,396	2,269	3,538	2,845	2,120	5,315
$1,000, 2007	12,808	16,748	15,472	12,681	8,637	952,384
2002	10,267	15,327	17,440	13,643	(D)	491,345
Aquaculture (see text) .... farms, 2007	70	54	31	40	26	81
2002	85	54	47	47	30	146
$1,000, 2007	56,219	4,011	2,567	3,507	2,228	2,683
2002	39,840	2,282	3,151	2,308	745	2,017
Other animals and other animal products (see text) .... farms, 2007	527	896	1,057	940	671	1,262
2002	301	458	651	563	393	744
$1,000, 2007	20,615	7,807	25,457	22,324	7,441	203,380
2002	13,940	3,594	19,743	10,276	5,002	3,709
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) .... farms, 2007	2,076	2,818	3,576	2,987	2,140	3,445
2002	1,632	2,333	3,205	2,455	1,796	2,565
$1,000, 2007	7,840	25,893	22,268	16,506	9,272	15,173
2002	5,889	18,412	17,968	11,651	9,001	10,497

See footnote(s) at end of table.

--continued

Table 2. **Market Value of Agricultural Products Sold Including Direct Sales: 2007 and 2002** - Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota
Total sales (see text) - Con.						
Value of sales by commodity or commodity group - Con.						
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse - Con.						
Tobacco ......farms, 2007	-	-	69	59	-	-
2002	6	-	160	50	-	-
$1,000, 2007	-	-	1,367	15,775	-	-
2002	(D)	-	2,713	15,355	-	-
Cotton and cottonseed ......farms, 2007	644	-	-	-	-	-
2002	1,072	-	-	-	-	-
$1,000, 2007	173,959	-	-	-	-	-
2002	158,806	-	-	-	-	-
Vegetables, melons, potatoes, and sweet potatoes [1] ......farms, 2007	748	976	940	1,010	2,871	2,720
2002	659	977	843	880	2,676	2,774
$1,000, 2007	53,448	155,147	56,394	59,180	347,305	275,912
2002	40,319	126,049	60,488	38,289	322,510	291,285
Fruits, tree nuts, and berries ......farms, 2007	926	1,102	608	1,207	3,407	934
2002	886	998	468	1,086	2,797	655
$1,000, 2007	19,358	85,183	19,393	100,623	392,472	18,517
2002	(D)	33,970	12,967	55,508	181,469	12,948
Nursery, greenhouse, floriculture, and sod (see text) ......farms, 2007	498	676	691	814	2,128	918
2002	665	769	769	902	2,185	983
$1,000, 2007	103,154	51,687	208,692	169,167	623,097	239,354
2002	87,833	37,334	188,484	153,540	628,699	224,410
Cut Christmas trees and short-rotation woody crops ......farms, 2007	87	236	180	280	900	280
2002	113	216	204	306	1,076	327
$1,000, 2007	4,670	(D)	2,398	(D)	29,155	4,984
2002	(D)	2,293	2,313	1,800	30,411	11,855
Other crops and hay (see text) ......farms, 2007	3,521	2,401	2,850	1,906	14,547	16,042
2002	2,816	1,757	2,129	1,449	12,504	15,306
$1,000, 2007	399,517	(D)	33,115	(D)	227,165	573,994
2002	396,391	14,916	15,682	11,220	208,618	471,367
Livestock, poultry, and their products ......farms, 2007	15,107	3,233	5,970	3,187	20,306	31,511
2002	15,050	2,546	5,426	2,114	18,203	33,319
$1,000, 2007	1,013,334	290,617	1,205,787	125,338	2,423,291	6,131,554
2002	750,192	241,247	843,101	107,244	1,409,807	4,012,745
Poultry and eggs ......farms, 2007	1,568	1,195	1,833	1,269	4,831	4,392
2002	1,081	734	1,316	565	2,206	2,667
$1,000, 2007	575,989	75,831	903,531	13,207	258,994	1,045,674
2002	417,755	78,848	583,343	12,107	146,700	750,088
Cattle and calves ......farms, 2007	10,977	1,447	2,947	1,066	11,631	22,122
2002	11,925	1,223	3,004	795	11,293	22,961
$1,000, 2007	223,922	15,660	58,293	12,444	449,371	1,385,740
2002	170,569	15,994	50,570	9,612	298,517	873,074
Milk and other dairy products from cows ......farms, 2007	321	461	676	310	2,453	5,258
2002	445	436	730	264	2,738	6,226
$1,000, 2007	72,020	126,392	192,426	50,485	1,285,571	1,475,929
2002	82,866	87,544	169,458	(D)	697,920	931,754
Hogs and pigs ......farms, 2007	525	460	454	350	2,930	4,748
2002	540	310	379	250	2,336	6,390
$1,000, 2007	1,235	813	(D)	2,108	357,495	2,139,877
2002	(D)	(D)	8,268	(D)	200,027	1,398,234
Sheep, goats, and their products ......farms, 2007	893	709	1,137	697	2,762	2,944
2002	594	490	745	459	2,307	2,891
$1,000, 2007	889	1,979	(D)	(D)	8,867	18,725
2002	392	801	1,179	1,127	6,613	13,351
Horses, ponies, mules, burros, and donkeys ......farms, 2007	2,554	322	813	348	3,010	2,238
2002	1,940	393	674	324	3,286	3,184
$1,000, 2007	20,118	(D)	31,815	5,703	23,550	11,424
2002	(D)	2,802	23,760	3,879	23,743	14,669
Aquaculture (see text) ...... farms, 2007	729	98	48	273	87	104
2002	474	78	48	140	83	103
$1,000, 2007	109,138	26,300	4,023	18,548	5,721	12,492
2002	41,285	31,944	1,459	9,481	3,316	8,991
Other animals and other animal products (see text) ......farms, 2007	386	359	452	449	1,497	1,193
2002	280	278	270	312	1,152	1,039
$1,000, 2007	10,022	(D)	3,920	(D)	33,721	41,692
2002	24,979	(D)	5,065	19,589	32,972	22,584
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ......farms, 2007	1,276	1,705	1,407	1,659	6,373	4,293
2002	1,216	1,454	1,168	1,259	4,925	3,847
$1,000, 2007	9,175	18,419	21,220	42,065	58,923	34,667
2002	4,897	11,237	12,551	31,315	37,269	22,763

See footnote(s) at end of table. --continued

Table 2. **Market Value of Agricultural Products Sold Including Direct Sales: 2007 and 2002** - Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire
Total sales (see text) - Con.						
Value of sales by commodity or commodity group - Con.						
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse - Con.						
Tobacco ....farms, 2007	-	111	-	-	-	-
2002	7	338	-	-	-	-
$1,000, 2007	-	5,022	-	-	-	-
2002	496	5,854	-	-	-	-
Cotton and cottonseed ....farms, 2007	980	498	-	-	-	-
2002	1,590	596	-	-	-	-
$1,000, 2007	362,705	164,714	-	-	-	-
2002	444,136	137,378	-	-	-	-
Vegetables, melons, potatoes, and sweet potatoes [1] ....farms, 2007	1,156	1,340	315	344	49	426
2002	903	961	242	261	54	320
$1,000, 2007	82,498	61,705	39,429	63,840	56,356	12,716
2002	39,942	36,723	28,027	58,337	35,689	8,465
Fruits, tree nuts, and berries ....farms, 2007	962	606	412	253	42	419
2002	1,001	1,113	372	158	51	278
$1,000, 2007	33,498	4,315	7,877	2,594	(D)	12,968
2002	14,093	22,823	5,771	1,375	(D)	9,321
Nursery, greenhouse, floriculture, and sod (see text) ....farms, 2007	479	913	367	371	45	382
2002	390	932	318	355	50	337
$1,000, 2007	46,007	121,280	29,472	41,215	11,949	65,554
2002	38,967	101,316	33,832	34,259	10,115	53,691
Cut Christmas trees and short-rotation woody crops ....farms, 2007	147	131	51	71	1	181
2002	162	196	54	84	2	173
$1,000, 2007	7,936	1,078	232	592	(D)	(D)
2002	7,611	1,843	623	797	(D)	2,028
Other crops and hay (see text) ....farms, 2007	4,907	25,596	6,981	9,733	942	1,453
2002	3,702	21,460	6,234	9,395	856	1,099
$1,000, 2007	45,511	173,618	187,672	206,577	141,930	(D)
2002	22,776	139,973	157,980	201,613	108,678	8,398
Livestock, poultry, and their products ....farms, 2007	19,262	60,300	14,392	23,869	1,808	1,827
2002	21,399	65,589	14,587	26,809	1,855	1,301
$1,000, 2007	3,208,753	4,017,988	1,529,340	8,662,710	293,928	92,584
2002	2,090,909	2,990,809	1,148,791	6,315,392	289,259	61,686
Poultry and eggs ....farms, 2007	3,262	6,114	1,396	1,875	213	793
2002	2,867	3,103	501	722	148	391
$1,000, 2007	2,438,690	1,265,166	7,975	165,265	(D)	15,390
2002	1,490,748	784,986	5,243	142,442	(D)	6,251
Cattle and calves ....farms, 2007	14,535	52,060	11,526	20,218	1,260	599
2002	16,494	57,957	11,793	23,416	1,283	526
$1,000, 2007	323,621	1,676,632	1,368,699	7,358,555	181,758	6,743
2002	228,346	1,285,288	1,015,169	5,401,018	215,054	5,140
Milk and other dairy products from cows ....farms, 2007	219	2,777	380	494	57	225
2002	431	3,233	235	642	47	194
$1,000, 2007	62,875	302,684	54,761	172,066	98,526	59,132
2002	67,954	300,460	41,842	148,941	62,074	(D)
Hogs and pigs ....farms, 2007	439	2,971	565	2,482	70	298
2002	504	3,752	542	3,594	102	212
$1,000, 2007	129,424	725,738	36,331	923,209	(D)	518
2002	82,298	570,551	26,531	590,581	930	(D)
Sheep, goats, and their products ....farms, 2007	1,026	3,677	1,522	1,637	330	514
2002	794	2,598	1,860	1,481	338	351
$1,000, 2007	1,659	9,580	20,962	10,072	7,003	(D)
2002	673	5,508	21,210	8,288	6,352	785
Horses, ponies, mules, burros, and donkeys ....farms, 2007	2,004	4,482	2,086	1,657	398	198
2002	2,684	5,710	2,527	1,761	448	174
$1,000, 2007	9,259	21,369	13,683	9,130	3,370	(D)
2002	11,390	27,111	12,870	11,098	2,928	875
Aquaculture (see text) ....farms, 2007	488	72	28	38	5	25
2002	515	85	26	39	16	16
$1,000, 2007	237,883	9,506	3,188	3,826	(D)	3,734
2002	207,181	11,107	4,185	2,170	(D)	3,340
Other animals and other animal products (see text) ....farms, 2007	514	1,254	407	408	64	289
2002	272	874	444	309	76	165
$1,000, 2007	5,343	7,313	23,742	20,585	898	(D)
2002	2,319	5,796	21,740	10,853	650	1,024
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ....farms, 2007	1,229	4,341	1,287	1,288	200	982
2002	1,192	3,942	1,164	1,088	246	748
$1,000, 2007	9,659	20,982	6,321	5,902	1,074	16,021
2002	7,506	14,712	4,523	4,015	1,606	10,420

See footnote(s) at end of table.

--continued

Table 2. **Market Value of Agricultural Products Sold Including Direct Sales: 2007 and 2002** - Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	New Jersey	New Mexico	New York	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio
Total sales (see text) - Con.						
Value of sales by commodity or commodity group - Con.						
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse - Con.						
Tobacco ....farms, 2007	-	-	-	2,622	-	475
2002	-	-	1	7,836	-	1,835
$1,000, 2007	-	-	-	549,636	-	10,229
2002	-	-	(D)	630,397	-	17,244
Cotton and cottonseed ....farms, 2007	-	198	-	1,305	-	-
2002	-	271	-	2,091	-	-
$1,000, 2007	-	26,006	-	211,129	-	-
2002	-	25,704	-	181,835	-	-
Vegetables, melons, potatoes, and sweet potatoes [1] ....farms, 2007	1,453	1,706	3,189	3,745	227	2,902
2002	1,442	446	2,759	3,005	261	2,376
$1,000, 2007	181,543	88,996	338,037	333,939	162,655	135,355
2002	167,956	96,914	322,577	215,247	133,894	136,844
Fruits, tree nuts, and berries ....farms, 2007	1,064	2,484	3,227	1,765	66	1,865
2002	966	2,102	2,989	1,376	23	1,814
$1,000, 2007	147,933	105,867	363,295	79,288	(D)	45,419
2002	87,148	59,061	180,540	55,756	(D)	34,532
Nursery, greenhouse, floriculture, and sod (see text) ....farms, 2007	1,682	231	2,009	2,317	71	2,104
2002	1,828	223	2,552	2,587	78	2,678
$1,000, 2007	442,953	60,267	389,117	573,529	9,126	444,855
2002	356,863	41,585	344,320	424,478	11,025	464,617
Cut Christmas trees and short-rotation woody crops ....farms, 2007	884	17	844	934	12	594
2002	899	20	1,001	1,043	15	775
$1,000, 2007	2,612	8	8,819	65,023	(D)	7,285
2002	3,852	369	(D)	57,625	(D)	9,323
Other crops and hay (see text) ....farms, 2007	2,493	3,691	12,091	9,366	6,819	16,062
2002	2,054	2,187	11,028	8,400	4,972	15,079
$1,000, 2007	16,751	139,447	147,013	95,943	298,303	105,160
2002	11,791	105,368	118,837	84,001	231,530	101,213
Livestock, poultry, and their products ....farms, 2007	4,017	10,550	17,317	26,448	11,352	33,031
2002	3,553	7,171	17,570	26,948	12,273	34,837
$1,000, 2007	135,233	1,621,940	2,856,706	7,707,350	1,045,697	2,960,490
2002	92,378	1,302,773	1,982,706	4,953,052	772,994	1,958,654
Poultry and eggs ....farms, 2007	1,360	1,150	3,810	6,003	578	5,539
2002	910	465	1,742	4,807	243	3,452
$1,000, 2007	33,044	(D)	123,727	4,087,004	28,496	883,301
2002	26,041	17,468	106,620	2,382,365	22,365	604,808
Cattle and calves ....farms, 2007	1,136	7,021	10,898	15,953	10,025	21,438
2002	1,227	5,622	11,972	18,584	10,944	22,938
$1,000, 2007	9,559	576,025	318,080	288,801	856,489	565,746
2002	7,094	533,952	251,121	185,222	625,070	408,242
Milk and other dairy products from cows ....farms, 2007	158	253	5,799	472	410	3,681
2002	138	182	6,681	706	551	4,255
$1,000, 2007	34,091	1,009,671	2,280,218	161,373	78,959	861,632
2002	29,154	730,083	1,560,895	150,406	65,450	551,877
Hogs and pigs ....farms, 2007	381	351	1,817	2,459	351	4,505
2002	378	306	1,490	2,332	474	4,976
$1,000, 2007	2,349	375	28,302	3,104,731	34,910	571,685
2002	2,313	381	14,005	2,183,646	25,888	322,687
Sheep, goats, and their products ....farms, 2007	1,218	2,577	2,252	3,544	742	4,907
2002	949	904	2,432	2,267	820	4,848
$1,000, 2007	1,784	(D)	10,246	6,632	8,479	14,186
2002	1,482	9,433	9,421	2,960	6,979	9,971
Horses, ponies, mules, burros, and donkeys ....farms, 2007	847	1,354	2,026	2,730	831	3,404
2002	878	1,186	2,200	2,621	972	5,658
$1,000, 2007	33,732	7,856	50,616	17,959	(D)	26,271
2002	18,314	6,600	15,223	15,202	(D)	31,260
Aquaculture (see text) .... farms, 2007	116	16	127	311	4	140
2002	50	19	157	202	6	100
$1,000, 2007	6,637	3,228	20,417	32,175	(D)	6,582
2002	2,223	1,604	15,185	17,669	(D)	3,338
Other animals and other animal products (see text) ....farms, 2007	444	304	1,439	1,591	369	2,576
2002	313	170	1,021	683	349	1,707
$1,000, 2007	14,036	2,982	25,101	8,676	33,986	31,088
2002	5,758	3,254	10,235	15,581	20,866	26,471
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ....farms, 2007	1,931	1,529	5,338	3,712	444	6,827
2002	1,769	1,071	4,651	3,054	452	6,205
$1,000, 2007	30,106	11,193	77,464	29,144	2,429	54,270
2002	19,126	6,582	59,724	17,245	1,765	37,217

See footnote(s) at end of table.

--continued

Table 2. **Market Value of Agricultural Products Sold Including Direct Sales: 2007 and 2002** - Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	Rhode Island	South Carolina
Total sales (see text) - Con.					
Value of sales by commodity or commodity group - Con.					
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse - Con.					
Tobacco ....farms, 2007	-	-	1,151	-	257
2002	-	-	893	-	874
$1,000, 2007	-	-	28,156	-	73,026
2002	-	-	15,413	-	104,521
Cotton and cottonseed ....farms, 2007	421	-	-	-	456
2002	581	-	-	-	489
$1,000, 2007	68,169	-	-	-	46,274
2002	43,685	-	-	-	33,101
Vegetables, melons, potatoes, and sweet potatoes [1] ....farms, 2007	842	1,462	4,300	208	1,511
2002	586	1,879	3,779	142	1,080
$1,000, 2007	25,315	339,388	125,623	8,111	126,311
2002	19,276	353,996	125,923	5,527	90,457
Fruits, tree nuts, and berries ....farms, 2007	2,204	4,187	3,222	159	1,013
2002	2,078	4,755	2,547	102	1,077
$1,000, 2007	17,543	515,582	151,101	4,483	34,481
2002	11,863	277,745	109,383	2,358	40,003
Nursery, greenhouse, floriculture, and sod (see text) ....farms, 2007	471	2,583	2,719	260	623
2002	578	3,039	3,073	225	771
$1,000, 2007	204,020	989,483	892,279	40,739	227,041
2002	168,259	806,851	732,709	37,593	219,980
Cut Christmas trees and short-rotation woody crops ....farms, 2007	63	1,320	1,205	49	179
2002	73	1,106	1,326	60	152
$1,000, 2007	785	116,759	22,727	(D)	7,558
2002	636	107,984	31,193	658	2,427
Other crops and hay (see text) ....farms, 2007	16,697	8,626	17,525	238	3,893
2002	12,234	8,225	13,818	156	2,933
$1,000, 2007	173,699	698,104	149,392	(D)	69,138
2002	143,166	498,687	103,136	831	21,177
Livestock, poultry, and their products ....farms, 2007	54,100	19,757	31,208	444	10,604
2002	58,248	21,030	29,152	305	10,133
$1,000, 2007	4,618,436	1,410,055	3,939,097	10,306	1,554,190
2002	3,637,326	1,000,586	2,936,045	8,408	896,505
Poultry and eggs ....farms, 2007	5,014	3,070	7,885	162	2,090
2002	2,726	2,478	4,028	76	1,113
$1,000, 2007	748,776	119,812	1,015,843	1,908	1,289,876
2002	508,373	86,506	745,624	1,766	694,290
Cattle and calves ....farms, 2007	45,512	13,077	19,784	148	6,782
2002	51,414	13,654	20,571	118	7,139
$1,000, 2007	3,062,020	800,336	556,192	846	105,282
2002	2,448,916	543,231	441,671	735	76,146
Milk and other dairy products from cows ....farms, 2007	1,022	592	8,407	39	115
2002	989	515	9,146	28	215
$1,000, 2007	191,775	401,786	1,890,190	4,599	52,550
2002	163,006	293,927	1,393,992	3,859	46,240
Hogs and pigs ....farms, 2007	2,274	1,466	3,440	81	700
2002	2,256	1,558	3,785	51	736
$1,000, 2007	555,521	5,662	336,437	354	77,211
2002	462,849	3,540	269,318	227	61,589
Sheep, goats, and their products ....farms, 2007	3,972	3,671	4,462	97	1,363
2002	3,032	3,699	3,425	65	991
$1,000, 2007	12,109	20,987	10,322	168	1,458
2002	6,672	17,397	7,355	104	878
Horses, ponies, mules, burros, and donkeys ....farms, 2007	4,706	2,578	3,398	30	1,443
2002	5,711	3,918	3,220	36	1,444
$1,000, 2007	36,191	18,935	49,320	313	21,622
2002	33,979	18,960	41,809	436	13,825
Aquaculture (see text) .... farms, 2007	56	96	292	27	93
2002	74	131	267	15	66
$1,000, 2007	3,253	16,270	44,519	1,653	4,775
2002	3,467	17,054	15,325	863	3,173
Other animals and other animal products (see text) ....farms, 2007	778	1,256	2,283	63	578
2002	664	1,176	1,456	40	215
$1,000, 2007	8,792	26,267	36,275	465	1,415
2002	10,064	19,973	20,951	419	363
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ....farms, 2007	3,194	6,274	7,537	249	1,323
2002	1,920	6,383	6,082	180	1,175
$1,000, 2007	11,534	56,362	75,893	6,292	12,660
2002	3,735	21,411	53,760	3,697	8,287

See footnote(s) at end of table.

--continued

Table 2. **Market Value of Agricultural Products Sold Including Direct Sales: 2007 and 2002** - Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Vermont
Total sales (see text) - Con.					
Value of sales by commodity or commodity group - Con.					
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse - Con.					
Tobacco ...farms, 2007	-	1,613	-	-	-
2002	-	8,151	-	-	-
$1,000, 2007	-	70,634	-	-	-
2002	-	141,412	-	-	-
Cotton and cottonseed ...farms, 2007	-	779	7,226	-	-
2002	-	920	8,866	-	-
$1,000, 2007	-	147,468	1,885,146	-	-
2002	-	178,354	1,088,675	-	-
Vegetables, melons, potatoes, and sweet potatoes [1] ...farms, 2007	140	1,483	2,348	532	506
2002	158	1,601	2,527	347	422
$1,000, 2007	3,464	71,870	373,704	16,092	13,192
2002	5,192	68,516	298,997	13,620	10,140
Fruits, tree nuts, and berries ...farms, 2007	61	327	7,033	615	499
2002	43	718	7,496	460	325
$1,000, 2007	412	2,552	219,819	17,022	15,875
2002	(D)	6,363	114,822	6,162	9,270
Nursery, greenhouse, floriculture, and sod (see text) ...farms, 2007	121	1,517	1,958	254	437
2002	119	2,323	2,137	275	418
$1,000, 2007	19,984	325,079	862,183	128,626	24,795
2002	18,350	282,815	704,699	92,646	22,803
Cut Christmas trees and short-rotation woody crops ...farms, 2007	19	177	254	33	255
2002	14	202	310	26	252
$1,000, 2007	202	2,018	7,606	342	3,448
2002	(D)	2,312	6,541	103	2,372
Other crops and hay (see text) ...farms, 2007	6,579	14,786	45,419	5,505	3,050
2002	6,573	14,741	30,044	3,986	2,710
$1,000, 2007	121,272	31,438	744,302	151,418	36,513
2002	145,766	47,896	418,557	115,127	24,231
Livestock, poultry, and their products ...farms, 2007	17,573	47,350	145,480	9,271	3,395
2002	19,625	51,367	148,859	8,059	3,161
$1,000, 2007	3,186,953	1,469,608	14,435,499	1,043,281	574,451
2002	2,258,715	1,127,266	10,402,993	858,101	401,482
Poultry and eggs ...farms, 2007	977	4,369	12,747	1,133	1,001
2002	451	2,554	6,319	645	571
$1,000, 2007	140,798	572,866	2,113,086	140,359	10,996
2002	70,820	359,286	1,260,951	84,178	5,875
Cattle and calves ...farms, 2007	15,171	38,961	116,626	6,257	1,937
2002	17,060	42,017	125,518	5,617	2,104
$1,000, 2007	2,307,618	633,303	10,503,774	347,299	57,581
2002	1,693,838	499,143	8,083,024	371,418	45,106
Milk and other dairy products from cows ...farms, 2007	672	1,115	1,268	422	1,222
2002	982	1,048	1,162	451	1,393
$1,000, 2007	279,765	180,503	1,245,441	292,141	493,926
2002	156,498	173,410	676,703	196,812	342,440
Hogs and pigs ...farms, 2007	1,042	1,160	4,053	630	239
2002	1,738	1,130	3,962	480	206
$1,000, 2007	381,360	33,797	237,504	196,595	697
2002	(D)	42,632	128,231	153,112	374
Sheep, goats, and their products ...farms, 2007	1,829	3,839	18,416	1,699	645
2002	2,074	3,331	15,314	1,372	436
$1,000, 2007	36,697	6,712	107,807	23,377	3,851
2002	31,285	4,196	94,164	17,804	1,581
Horses, ponies, mules, burros, and donkeys ...farms, 2007	1,408	5,149	14,107	1,610	266
2002	1,850	6,847	15,477	1,725	235
$1,000, 2007	8,884	31,212	117,744	10,020	2,454
2002	(D)	38,201	91,567	7,776	2,853
Aquaculture (see text) ... farms, 2007	12	106	275	27	23
2002	10	197	392	41	26
$1,000, 2007	3,108	4,893	46,102	4,074	1,989
2002	(D)	4,799	31,058	5,746	1,325
Other animals and other animal products (see text) ...farms, 2007	351	1,494	4,211	543	332
2002	313	977	2,404	308	258
$1,000, 2007	28,723	6,322	64,042	29,415	2,957
2002	23,179	5,599	37,295	21,255	1,927
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ...farms, 2007	752	3,581	8,619	1,584	1,474
2002	713	3,392	8,459	1,115	1,163
$1,000, 2007	6,158	15,380	38,696	10,098	22,863
2002	3,789	11,227	25,639	6,983	9,567

See footnote(s) at end of table.

--continued

Table 2. **Market Value of Agricultural Products Sold Including Direct Sales: 2007 and 2002** - Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Virginia	Washington	West Virginia	Wisconsin	Wyoming
Total sales (see text) - Con.					
Value of sales by commodity or commodity group - Con.					
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse - Con.					
Tobacco ..... farms, 2007	892	-	70	195	-
2002	4,163	-	530	452	-
$1,000, 2007	68,073	-	758	3,400	-
2002	112,503	-	3,413	6,111	-
Cotton and cottonseed ..... farms, 2007	196	-	-	-	-
2002	312	-	-	-	-
$1,000, 2007	25,203	-	-	-	-
2002	20,718	-	-	-	-
Vegetables, melons, potatoes, and sweet potatoes [1] ..... farms, 2007	1,619	2,082	712	3,320	48
2002	1,303	2,041	411	2,957	28
$1,000, 2007	93,988	809,963	5,811	422,639	3,501
2002	79,345	805,567	4,613	341,615	1,798
Fruits, tree nuts, and berries ..... farms, 2007	1,358	5,988	365	1,719	22
2002	1,251	6,215	404	1,331	11
$1,000, 2007	68,193	2,081,031	14,206	218,248	(D)
2002	40,954	1,354,238	11,443	107,972	87
Nursery, greenhouse, floriculture, and sod (see text) ..... farms, 2007	1,040	1,472	323	1,635	56
2002	1,241	1,883	371	1,487	50
$1,000, 2007	248,153	327,046	23,371	244,216	6,339
2002	218,698	391,930	26,849	197,439	5,301
Cut Christmas trees and short-rotation woody crops ..... farms, 2007	352	534	173	849	3
2002	514	508	184	859	4
$1,000, 2007	6,949	23,225	935	17,822	(D)
2002	9,633	26,270	1,182	23,412	41
Other crops and hay (see text) ..... farms, 2007	10,432	6,900	7,771	21,691	3,166
2002	9,156	6,399	4,378	16,449	2,298
$1,000, 2007	77,961	554,702	21,267	119,660	130,888
2002	78,384	422,822	12,618	120,249	86,027
Livestock, poultry, and their products ..... farms, 2007	27,744	17,178	14,261	39,619	6,797
2002	29,060	14,372	11,616	38,793	6,433
$1,000, 2007	2,047,887	2,037,958	513,357	6,298,032	943,728
2002	1,642,692	1,747,922	413,121	3,933,204	726,111
Poultry and eggs ..... farms, 2007	3,790	3,810	2,434	7,058	610
2002	2,140	1,540	995	3,110	254
$1,000, 2007	971,851	228,825	301,708	375,284	997
2002	750,035	143,962	250,922	224,968	663
Cattle and calves ..... farms, 2007	21,884	9,521	10,474	30,193	4,880
2002	23,970	8,979	9,513	31,807	4,997
$1,000, 2007	574,506	716,720	164,962	1,014,553	801,833
2002	471,703	709,585	117,967	834,895	643,123
Milk and other dairy products from cows ..... farms, 2007	1,173	823	161	14,270	32
2002	1,253	884	395	16,972	81
$1,000, 2007	330,344	873,365	31,386	4,573,294	22,331
2002	275,402	634,908	32,202	2,651,018	7,473
Hogs and pigs ..... farms, 2007	964	1,596	1,042	3,516	368
2002	834	1,067	717	3,245	247
$1,000, 2007	56,960	5,921	2,089	100,309	41,923
2002	72,213	6,803	1,992	79,836	23,057
Sheep, goats, and their products ..... farms, 2007	2,951	2,762	1,860	3,212	1,004
2002	2,278	1,971	1,397	2,456	1,019
$1,000, 2007	7,710	6,738	3,241	17,141	34,292
2002	6,030	4,902	2,168	10,545	28,853
Horses, ponies, mules, burros, and donkeys ..... farms, 2007	2,247	2,938	1,291	2,845	1,967
2002	3,007	2,698	891	2,949	1,555
$1,000, 2007	46,876	26,134	4,476	12,873	24,631
2002	40,581	18,599	3,787	14,986	12,400
Aquaculture (see text) ..... farms, 2007	182	355	39	169	20
2002	182	334	50	208	17
$1,000, 2007	53,032	162,867	3,478	14,182	7,157
2002	19,945	215,130	2,712	14,262	3,213
Other animals and other animal products (see text) ..... farms, 2007	1,293	1,398	737	1,640	225
2002	682	798	390	1,216	174
$1,000, 2007	6,606	17,388	2,017	190,395	10,564
2002	6,782	14,033	1,372	102,694	7,329
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ..... farms, 2007	2,855	5,418	1,990	6,243	645
2002	2,513	4,527	1,434	4,918	521
$1,000, 2007	28,878	43,537	7,097	43,491	3,025
2002	16,825	34,753	4,588	29,072	2,381

[1] 2002 data do not include potatoes, sweet potatoes, or ginseng.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on March 22, 2010, I posted San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace's Hearing Request and Petition to Intervene and San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace's Petition for Waiver of 10 C.F.R. Part 51 Subpart A Appendix B and 10 C.F.R. § 51.53(C)(2) on the NRC's Electronic Information Exchange. It is my understanding that as a result, the following persons were served:

Office of the Secretary Rules and Adjudications Branch U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission 11555 Rockville Pike Rockville, MD 20852 hearingdocket@nrc.gov	David A. Repka, Esq. Tyson R. Smith, Esq. Winston & Strawn, LLP 1700 K Street N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006-3817 drepka@winston.com, trsmith@winston.com
Susan Uttal, Esq. Lloyd Subin, Esq. Office of General Counsel Mail Stop O-15D21 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555 Susan.Uttal@nrc.gov Lloyd.Subin@nrc.gov	E. Roy Hawkens Chief Administrative Judge Atomic Safety and Licensing Board U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555 Roy.Hawkens@nrc.gov

Electronically signed by
Diane Curran